




Michael G. Mayer

James. Dent

The Catholic Library—7

HOLY MASS
VOL. II.

ROEHAMPTON;
PRINTED BY JOHN GRIFFIN.

HOLY MASS

THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE

AND

THE ROMAN LITURGY

BY

THE REV. HERBERT LUCAS, S.J.

VOL. II.

LONDON:

THE MANRESA PRESS, ROEHAMPTON, S.W.
B. HERDER, 68, GREAT RUSSELL STREET, W.C.

1914

BX
2230
.L82
1914
V.2

Nihil Obstat:

S. GEORGIUS KIERAN HYLAND, S.T.D.,

CENSOR DEPUTATUS

Imprimatur:

✠ PETRUS EPÛS SOUTHWARC.

PREFATORY NOTE.

A CONSIDERABLE portion of the contents of the present volume, notably Chapters X.—XIII. and XVI., will be found to be of a more contentious nature than those of its predecessor. But for this very reason it is only right to say that it would be a matter for very serious regret if, because I have found myself unable to agree with Dr. Fortescue on certain points connected with the history and structure of the Roman Canon, I should have seemed to underrate his really admirable and all but exhaustive study of the Roman liturgy. So far from wishing to create any such impression, the best advice I could give to any student who wishes to know more about the Mass than he can learn from these pages, would be to procure and to study Dr. Fortescue's more learned work. At its close he will find a very full bibliography of the subject; a fact which renders it quite needless to burden this little volume with a bibliographical appendix, which no one would be likely to use who lacks the opportunity of consulting Dr. Fortescue's treatise. To the reader who is familiar with Latin

I would further recommend the study of Cardinal Bona's classical work, *De Rebus Liturgicis*. Dr. Gühr's treatise on the Mass, now happily translated into English, needs no commendation from the present writer.

Having in mind the judicious remarks of a friendly critic who has been at the pains of reading the proofs of the present volume, I take the opportunity of saying that, whereas my aim throughout has been to make the book sufficiently interesting to be popular, and at the same time scholarly enough to be helpful to the student, I have reason to fear that some parts of it (notably chap. xvi.) are of too technical a nature to engage the attention of the "general reader." To the general reader, I would venture respectfully to suggest that he may find it profitable to use freely the method of "skipping" such passages as may not appeal to him, rather than the easier one of tossing the book aside.

H. L.

*St. Francis Xavier's,
Liverpool,
March, 1914.*

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER IX. PAGE

THE PREFACE I

CHAPTER X.

THE CANON (1) 16

CHAPTER XI.

THE CANON (2) 31

CHAPTER XII.

THE CANON (3) 42

CHAPTER XIII.

THE CANON (4) 59

CHAPTER XIV.

THE PATER NOSTER, THE FRACTION, AND THE
COMMUNION 69

CHAPTER XV.

THE SAINTS AND THE MASS 87

CHAPTER XVI.

THE ROMAN AND THE EARLY GALLICAN RITES 94

CHAPTER IX.

THE PREFACE.

THE "Preface" of the Mass, as we know it, serves as an immediate introduction to the Canon, from which it is separated by the "Sanctus" or "Ter-sanctus." It is further distinguished from the Canon by being, within certain limits, variable, whereas the Canon, as its name denotes, remains, with the exception of a few special clauses, unchanged throughout the year. Hence to say that the Preface ought to be regarded as part of the Canon would be, so far as mere etymology is concerned, a sort of contradiction in terms. Yet that is precisely what, in view of the history of the liturgy and the true significance of its parts, one would like to say; and it is what, in effect, some early Latin Mass-books actually do say. In the earliest extant MS. of the Gelasianum the rubric: "Incipit Canon actionis" precedes the Preface; and the same is true of at least three other MSS.¹ At any rate, no mistake will be made if the truth be emphasized that the preface, with its preliminary dialogue ("Sursum corda," &c.) is an integral part of what in the Greek liturgies is called the "Ana-

¹ Ebner, *Quellen u. Forschungen z. Gesch. des Missale Romanum*, p. 295; cf. Fortescue, p. 315.

phora," or, to use a thoroughly Roman term, an integral part of the sacrificial "Action."

For there can, I believe, be little doubt that, in quite primitive times, the great Eucharistic prayer, or prayer of thanksgiving, proceeded without interruption from the beginning of what is now the preface down to the end of what corresponds to our Canon, embodying in its midst, of course, the sacred words of consecration. The truth of this statement, at least in its general bearing, may be illustrated first of all by quoting, with some abridgment for the avoidance of repetition, the earliest extant description of the Mass.¹ This is to be found in the "Apology" (or "First Apology") of St. Justin the Martyr, who suffered death in A.D. 167. The "Apology" was addressed to the Roman Emperor, Antoninus Pius, about A.D. 150, the purpose of the passage in question being to refute malicious calumnies by giving a true account of what Christians were accustomed to do at their religious assemblies. Here then is, in substance, what he says:—

"On the day called of the Sun, we all come together from town and country, and at our meeting the memoirs of the apostles, or the writings of the prophets, are read as far as time allows. When the reader has finished, the president (*i.e.*, the celebrant) gives an instruction and an exhortation (*νουθεσίαν καὶ πρόκλησιν*) on what has been read.

¹ An excellent unabridged translation will be found in Fortescue, pp. 18 ff. To the reading of one clause alone exception may be taken, as will be pointed out in chap. xiii.

Then we all rise and put up prayers (εὐχὰς πέμπομεν)¹ in common, both for ourselves and for all others wheresoever they may be, very earnestly (ἐκτενῶς),² to the intent that having attained to the knowledge of the truth the further grace may be vouchsafed to us that we may be found to be of good conversation by our deeds (δι' ἔργων ἀγαθοὶ πολιτευταί), and observers of the commandments, whereby we may gain eternal salvation. When we have finished these prayers, we salute one another with the kiss of peace. Then bread and a cup of water and wine are brought to him who presides over the brethren, and he having received them, sends up praise and glory to the Father of all things, through the name of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, and gives thanks at great length (ἐπὶ πολὺν, ὅση δύναμις αὐτῷ) for having been deemed worthy of these things by Him (ὑπὲρ τοῦ καταξιῶσθαι τούτων παρ' αὐτοῦ). And after he has finished the prayers and thanksgiving all the people cry aloud, 'Amen,' which word in Hebrew signifies, 'So be it.' And after the president has finished his thanksgiving and the people have responded, those who among us are called deacons distribute the bread and wine over which the thanksgiving has been uttered to all who are present (ἢ διάδοσις καὶ μετάληψις ἀπὸ τῶν εὐχαριστηθέντων ἐκάστῳ γίνεται), and carry them to those who are absent."³

¹ *Apol.* i. 67.

² So we should probably read for ἐκτενῶς, which, like the rest of the text, rests on the authority of a single MS.

³ *Apol.* i. 65 and 67 combined.

He then, in a very striking passage, goes on to speak of the faith of Christians concerning the Eucharist.¹ This I must needs omit, and dwell rather on the fact that we have here an outline of the liturgy of the Mass as it was celebrated, possibly in Rome, but more probably at Ephesus, in St. Justin's time. I say, more probably at Ephesus, not only because St. Justin habitually lived there, though he twice made some stay in Rome, but also because his "Dialogue," written shortly after the Apology, unquestionably has Ephesus for its scene. The service thus described consisted of the following items:

1. Lessons from the apostolical or prophetical writings.
2. A homily by the bishop on what had been read.
3. Solemn prayers, made by all in common, for the faithful at large.²
4. The Kiss of Peace.
5. The presentation of the bread and mixed chalice to the bishop.
6. A long thanksgiving prayer, made by the bishop, to which the people answer, Amen.
7. The Communion.

Now having the description in view, I hardly know whether it is too much to say that, if the

¹ See Fortescue, pp. 19, 21.

² These correspond to the deacon's litany or litanies of the Eastern liturgies, and to the series of prayers recited after the Gospel on Good Friday in the Roman rite. See vol. i. pp. 88 ff.

" Sanctus " had held its present position in Justin's time, " it is incredible that he should have passed over in silence this solemn chant, considering that he twice mentions, with some emphasis, the final response or acclamation, ' Amen.' " ¹ Still, the argument from silence is proverbially precarious; and although it is, I think, not without its weight in the present case, it must not, of course, be unduly pressed.

The testimony of St. Clement of Rome (c. A.D. 96—98), which at first sight might seem decisive as against the view here taken, must not, of course, be overlooked. He writes: " The Scripture says: ' Ten thousand times ten thousand waited on Him, and a thousand thousand served Him and cried: Holy, holy, holy, Lord of hosts, every creature is full of Thy glory.' Let us then also, with one mind, gathered together into one place in [obedience to our] conscience (ἐν ὁμονοίᾳ ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συναχθέντες τῇ συνειδήσει) cry to Him constantly (ἐκτενῶς) as with one voice, that we may become sharers in His great and glorious promises." ² Now a careful examination of this passage should, I think, convince the reader of the truth of the following statements, viz.:

(1) Clement does not assert that, in his day,

¹ Lucas, " Fresh Light on the Early History of the Mass," in *The Month*, February, 1900. From this article much of the present chapter is taken.

² Clem. Rom. *Epist.* I. xxxiv. 6, 7 (Funk, *Patres Apostolici*, i. 142). Cf. Fortescue, p. 13, where the hortative "βοήσωμεν" is rendered "we cry." Funk notes no variant reading here.

Christians actually chanted the "Tersanctus." In fact, he does not here make any assertion at all as to the form or forms of prayer which they used. What he does is to exhort them to pray after a certain fashion. But how? They are very earnestly or constantly to beg for a participation in the divine promises. The angels are introduced by way of comparison. The writer urges that as they with one voice cry: "Holy, holy, holy," &c., so we as with one voice should cry out for mercy.

(2) It is by no means certain, though it is highly probable, that Clement here refers specifically to the liturgy (σύναξις). For the phrase which has been translated above, "gathered together . . . in obedience to our conscience" may quite possibly mean "gathered together in conscience" or, as we might say, united by a common faith.

And (3), even if it be assumed, perhaps wrongly, that the words in question must be understood as alluding to the actual use of the "Tersanctus," and, rightly perhaps, that they have reference to the liturgy, it is at least plain enough that they give no clue at all to the position which the "Tersanctus" held, or may be supposed to have held, in the service. The point of this last remark will be clear from a document to be presently cited in which a form of "Tersanctus" occurs just before the Communion. Hence it may, I think, be safely concluded that, whatever may be the force of the argument from "the silence of Justin," it is not affected by the witness of Clement.¹

¹ But see Fortescue in the *Cath. Encyclop.* xiii. 432.

But indeed, it is the less needful to rest the case on the testimony of St. Justin, which on this particular point may be regarded as wholly negative, because a document has been preserved which actually contains a form of Anaphora whose continuity is unbroken by the "Sanctus." This is the liturgy embodied in the "Ordinances of the Egyptian Church."¹ The story of the document and of its recovery is too long and complicated to be told here; but the text of the Anaphora with its interesting rubrics, deserves to be quoted in full.²

"And the deacon brings the oblation to [the newly consecrated Bishop]; and he lays his hands upon the oblation, with all the presbyters, and giving thanks (εὐχαριστῶν) says thus: The Lord be with you all.

And all the people shall say: With Thy spirit.

¹A Latin translation of the liturgy was published so long ago as 1691, in Job Leutholf's *Historia Aetheopica*, ii. 324 ff. Bunsen, in 1843, seems to have been the first to recognize its importance as representing the most primitive type of the Eucharistic prayer. But his judgment was little heeded till the original texts began to come to light. Cf. Lagarde, *Aegyptiaca* (1883, reprinted 1896), pp. 249 ff.; Achelis, *Die älteste Quellen des Orientalischen Kirchenrechtes* (1891) pp. 48 ff.; Brightman, *Eastern Liturgies* (1896) pp. lxxv. 189 ff.; Funk, *Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum* (1905) II. xix. ff. 97 ff. Dr. Fortescue apparently does not consider this document of importance, for he does not, I think, even mention it. Dom R. H. Connolly on the other hand (*The Tablet*, 1912, ii. 865) speaks of "the liturgy of the Ethiopic Church Order, and [that of] Serapion" as "our earliest certain texts of liturgies."

²The translation here given is that of J. C. Ball (*apud* Brightman, *l.c.*), corrected, however, from Funk's Latin version (*Didascalia*, ii. 99 f.).

And he shall say: Lift up your hearts.

And all the people shall say: We have them [lifted up] to the Lord.

And he shall say: Let us give thanks to the Lord.

And all the people shall say: (It is) right and just.

And again let him pray in this manner, and say what follows according to the tradition (or institution) of the holy oblation. Then they (i.e., the presbyters), following the bishop, say the Eucharistic prayer:—

“We give Thee thanks, O Lord, through Thy beloved Son Jesus Christ, whom in the last days Thou hast sent to us as a Saviour and Redeemer, the messenger of Thy counsel. He is the Word that is from Thee, through whom Thou madest all things by Thy will. And Thou didst send Him from Heaven into the bosom of a Virgin. He was made Flesh and was borne in her womb. And Thy Son was made known by the Holy Ghost, that He might fulfil Thy will, and that He might prepare Thy people for Thee. Stretching forth His hands He suffered, to loose the sufferers that trust in Thee.¹ Who was delivered of His own will to suffering that He might destroy death, and burst the bonds of Satan and trample on hell, and lead forth the saints and established ordinances and make known His resurrection. Taking bread, then, He gave thanks and said: Take, eat, this is My Body which is broken for you. And in like manner the cup

¹ Funk connects “*expandendo manus suas*” with the preceding sentence.

also and said: This is My Blood, which is shed for you; as often as ye do this, ye shall do it in remembrance of Me.

“Remembering, therefore, His death and His resurrection, we offer Thee this bread and cup, giving thanks to Thee that Thou hast made us meet to stand before Thee and do Thee priestly service. We beseech Thee therefore that Thou wouldst send Thy Holy Spirit on the oblation of this Church, and that Thou wouldst grant also to all that partake of it that it may be to them unto sanctification, that they may be filled with the Holy Spirit, and that they may be strengthened in true faith,¹ that they may extol and praise Thee in Thy Son Jesus Christ, in whom to Thee be glory and dominion in the holy Church both now and for ever, and world without end. Amen.”

Now lest it should seem that undue stress is here laid on the foregoing passage, as well as on others to be hereafter quoted from documents of a similar and more or less apocryphal character, it may be well to forestall the objection that “there is no evidence to show that the liturgies or liturgical fragments embodied in such documents were ever actually in use.” To this I would answer that a distinction must be drawn between the positive and the negative testimony of these compilations. For the most part no argument (except as regards provenance) can, I think, be legitimately drawn from the verbal text of any prayer which they contain.

¹ “Ad confirmationem fidei in veritate.”

Nor can we, apart from external evidence of a corroborative kind, be sure that any particular prayer or ceremony, even taken as a whole, which one or other of them may happen to give, represents a constitutive element of the primitive rite. The structure of these unauthentic liturgies, so far as it may happen to embody elements not demonstrably primitive, presumably represents contemporary rather than more ancient usage. Hence I cannot attach to the positive witness of the "Clementine" liturgy of the "Apostolic Constitutions," the importance which is ascribed to it by Probst, or even, in a lesser degree, by Dr. Fortescue. But if, on the other hand, it be borne in mind that, in "faked" documents, primitive texts are apt to be expanded by interpolation rather than shortened by omissions, it should be plain that what these documents omit is of far higher significance, for purposes of inferential reconstruction, than what they contain. And something of the same kind may be said of instances in which elements of the liturgy whose place has been long since fixed are found in fourth-century compilations, to occupy a different or a varying position.

To apply these principles to the case in hand, it is to me simply incredible that the rigidly simple form of the Eucharistic prayer which is found in the Ethiopic Ordinances should be of later origin than, for instance, the elaborate though singularly beautiful Anaphora of the so-called "Apostolic Constitutions," which, of course, contains the "Sanctus." Nor can I bring myself to believe that, if the

"Sanctus" had already found a place in the Anaphora it would ever have lost it. Hence, without, of course, pretending that the Anaphora of the Church Ordinances is verbally identical with that which was in use in Rome in the early years of the second century, I do venture to maintain—till fresh light be thrown on the subject—the structural identity of the Eucharistic prayer of the Ordinances with the corresponding portion of the liturgy as described by St. Justin. It is a prayer in which thanks are given to God "for that He has made us meet (or deemed us worthy) to stand before Him, and to do Him priestly service," words which seem to echo a phrase of St. Justin's. Both authorities seem to me to point to a time when the unity of the "thank-prayer" ("Dankgebet," as the Germans call it) had not yet been broken by the intercalation of the "Tersanctus."

There is, indeed, one witness, of relatively late date, whose words might seem fatal to the opinion here put forward, at least in so far as this opinion relates to the time of St. Justin. Anastasius, the compiler of the "Liber Pontificalis," tells us that Pope Xystus I. (119—128) ordered that the "Sanctus" should be sung "intra actionem," *i.e.*, within the Anaphora. Now this testimony, whatever its value, cuts both ways. It implies on the one hand that (as here maintained) the "Sanctus" *was* inserted into the Eucharistic prayer, which hitherto had been without it. But on the other hand, it asserts that the change was made at an earlier date than that of Justin's "Apology." Hence it might

seem that Justin's negative testimony must be ruled out of court. But not necessarily so. For first of all the statements of Anastasius are not in the nature of contemporary evidence, and must be accepted with caution. It is possible that he has attributed to Xystus I. a change really introduced by a later Pope; for the tendency always was to antedate events rather than to postdate them. Or again, it is possible that the Papal ordinance may not have been forthwith carried into effect, except in Rome and its neighbourhood, and probable that St. Justin describes the practice of the church at Ephesus. All this, however, is somewhat problematical; and it must be admitted that the statement of the "Liber Pontificalis" is of sufficient weight to make a careful writer hesitate to affirm anything more than this, that the primitive Anaphora had no "Sanctus" "within the action," and that in the Ethiopic document which has been quoted we have either an actual or a reflected survival of the earliest usage. It should be added that in the liturgy embodied in the so-called "Testament of our Lord Jesus Christ," a fourth-century compilation of which the Syriac text was published in 1899 by Mgr. Rahmani, a short "Benedictus," followed by a short form of the "Sanctus," occurs in what was perhaps the earliest position of both, viz., not "within the action," but just before the Communion, as follows:

"The Deacon. Let us earnestly beseech our Lord and God that He would grant to us to be of one mind in the Spirit.

The Bishop. Grant us to be of one mind in the Holy Spirit, and heal our souls by this oblation, that we may live in Thee for ever and ever.

The People. Amen.

Let the people, praying, repeat the same. This done let the giving of thanks be closed after this manner.

[*The Bishop.*] May the name of the Lord be blessed for ever.

The People. Amen.

The Priest (sic). Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord, blessed is the name of His glory.

Let all the people say: So be it, So be it."

And again it is directed that each of the faithful, immediately before receiving his fragment of the Sacred Host, is to say,

"Holy, Holy, Holy Trinity unspeakable, grant me that I may receive this Body unto life and not unto condemnation."¹

The "Testament," it may be added, though in its extant form not older than the fourth century, contains some archaic features which seem to point to an earlier date than that of the Ethiopic Ordinances, but its relation to these and other like documents cannot be said to have been satisfactorily established.²

Here, it is true, we have neither the full "Ter sanctus" nor the full Benedictus of the later litur-

¹ Rahmani, *Testamentum D.N.J.C.* (1899), p. 45.

² Funk, *Didascalia*, II. xiii.

gies. But the use of such tentative and incomplete formulæ as these would easily pave the way for the introduction of the fuller and more scriptural invocations with which we are now familiar. And the mention of Angels and Archangels, Cherubim and Seraphim, in that portion of the prayer wherein God is praised for the works of creation, would afford a ready "cue" for the placing of the invocations there, rather than at the conclusion of the Anaphora.

For the rest, it must be enough to say that, subsequently to the very early introduction of the "Sanctus" into the Anaphora, the preface (for such it now became) underwent sundry changes, especially in the Western Church. At first, like the rest of the liturgy, it doubtless had a form deemed suitable for use on any day and every day of the ecclesiastical year. It contained a more or less general recital of God's benefits to man and to His chosen people, either (as in the Clementine liturgy) from creation downwards, or, more briefly, in and through the Incarnation and Passion of our Lord. In the West, but never in the East, this unchanging preface (unchanging, that is, in each local church) gave place to a great variety of more specialized and often shorter forms adapted to particular festivals or seasons.

Of such prefaces we find a considerable number in the earliest Roman Mass-books. In fact there are in the Leonianum, says Dr. Fortescue, "altogether 267, practically one for each Mass,"

and 54 in the Gelasianum.¹ The Gregorian book has only ten, and the reduction of the number was doubtless due to St. Gregory himself, whose activity in the matter of liturgical reform and simplification is worthily emulated by his illustrious successor, Pope Pius X., now happily reigning. To the ten Prefaces of St. Gregory, one only, that of our Lady, has since been added. And finally, as the Roman rite gradually came into all but universal use throughout the West, the old local varieties of the preface passed into comparative oblivion, to be rescued from their obscurity in modern times, and studied as liturgical relics of the past.

In conclusion, it may perchance help our devotion in hearing or celebrating Holy Mass to bear in mind that, in reciting the preface, we are engaged upon a form of prayer which—having regard to its general purport rather than to its every word—is, with the sole exception of the words of consecration, absolutely the most primitive portion of the liturgy; more primitive, indeed, than the bulk of the Canon itself.

¹ Fortescue, pp. 318 ff., where many interesting details are given.

CHAPTER X.

THE CANON (1).

THAT the Canon of the Mass, as we know it, does not exhibit throughout a primitive text of apostolic antiquity hardly needs proof. St. Gregory the Great himself describes the composition, or rather, as we might say, the redaction of the "prex" as he calls it, to one whom he styles "scholasticus," a scholar or learned man; one, doubtless, who in modern times would have been an important official of the Sacred Congregation of Rites.¹ Nor is it to be thought that herein St. Gregory (c. 600) contradicts his predecessor, Innocent I., who, writing nearly two hundred years earlier (c. 410), might be imagined by an incautious reader to claim an apostolic origin for the very text of the liturgy. In fact, however, he is not, in the passage referred to, dealing with the text of the liturgy, but is concerned to express his disapproval of a particular practice, which he declares to be neither

¹ "Precem quem scholasticus composuerat" (*Epist.* ix. 12, *P.L.* lxxvii. 957). The writer of the letter uses the word "prex" in its technical or quasi-technical sense. The transition from the term "prex" to "Canon" is seen to be in process in a letter of Vigilius (c. 540) to Profuturus of Braga. He there calls it "prex canonica" (*P.L.* lxix. 18). Dates are here given, approximately, in round numbers, as being easier to remember and keep in mind.

in accordance with primitive tradition nor sanctioned by authority.¹ In his famous letter to Decentius of Gubbio he speaks of the manner of procedure ("quem morem . . . in consecrandis mysteriis teneat") and of the ritual observance of the Roman Church ("Romanae ecclesiae institutiones"), which he declares are to be preferred to the "custom" of any other Church ("alterius quam ecclesiae Romanae consuetudinem"). That which was handed on by St. Peter ("quod a principe apostolorum Petro Romanae Ecclesiae traditum est"), is, he says, to be held fast by all; nor is anything to be added thereto without authority ("quod auctoritatem non habeat"); and the Churches of Gaul, Spain, and Africa are to follow the lead of the Roman Church ("oportet eos hoc sequi quod ecclesia Romana custodit"), to which they all owe their origin.

We need not, then, be deterred by the reverence which is due to so venerable a monument of antiquity as is the Roman Canon from investigating its structure, or from endeavouring to discover whatever can be discovered of the history of its formation. But in attempting any such inquiry, it should never be forgotten that, although the exercise of reasonable conjecture cannot be ruled entirely out of court, conjecture is, after all, admissible only when evidence, direct or indirect, is lacking; and that recourse should never be had to the conjectural method except when there is some strong positive ground for believing that there is

¹ *Epist.* xxv. 3, *P.L.* xx. 552-3.

a real problem to be solved. In the case of liturgical formulæ, for instance, the mere circumstance that an erudite scholar imagines that he could arrange a series of prayers in a more logical order, or that he could better their phrasing, is not of itself a sufficient reason for setting to work on the task of conjectural reconstruction. As Mr. Brightman, for instance, has very well said: "It is easy to compare the Roman paragraphs with their parallels in the Syrian rite, and then re-arrange them in the Syrian order; but this hardly proves that they ever stood in this order."¹ Moreover, great caution is to be used lest undue weight be attached to instances of mere verbal parallelism between prayers which may be found in two or more liturgies. Such verbal parallelism of itself proves nothing, unless, indeed, it be either extensive and continuous, or of frequent recurrence, or such as to point unmistakably to some conclusion affecting the very structure of the liturgy.

But to come to the point. That in the course of the three and a half centuries which elapsed between the time of St. Justin (c. 150) and that of St. Gelasius (c. 490), the Canon underwent a process of development from a primitive nucleus, and that the "scholasticus" who had left it in the form in which St. Gregory knew it must have had his predecessors in the work of revision and redaction, may be safely assumed.² But it should, I

¹ Brightman, *apud* Fortescue, pp. 165 f.

² On the external evidence available for this period see below, Chapter xiii.

think, be also assumed, in default of clear evidence to the contrary, that the process of development was orderly, and was carried out under the effective control of authority. And the presumption would seem to be in favour of those who would vindicate for the Roman Canon a more or less perfect organic unity, rather than of that class of writers who imagine that they see in it a kind of patchwork, of which most of the component parts are thought to have somehow got out of their right place. For such is the impression which might be produced by the theories of Baumstark, Buchwald and Drews, as recorded by Dr. Fortescue.¹ These theories, for reasons expressed or implied above, it has not seemed necessary to discuss. They are, I cannot but think, symptomatic of a certain critical restlessness which is characteristic of our time, and which may all too easily lead even the most learned scholars altogether too far into the region of ill-founded conjecture.

Nor ought it to be to us a matter of indifference whether the Roman Canon was developed after the somewhat free and irresponsible fashion of other liturgies, Eastern and Western, now or formerly current, or whether it is the outcome of that conservative adherence to apostolic tradition, combined with the exercise of plenary authority to make such changes as might in course of time be deemed necessary or desirable, which has always been characteristic of Papal Rome.

¹ Fortescue, pp. 148 ff.

A sober examination of the text of the Canon will, I venture to hope, convince the reader that in so far as it is not actually "primitive," it is the result of a singularly well-considered redaction or series of redactions, and that its parts, with a possible and partial exception in the case of the "Mementos" for the living and the dead, belong and belonged from the outset just where they are, and nowhere else; that is to say, that the additions to the primitive text, as they were successively made, were rightly placed in their present position.

It will be well to begin with the series of intercessory and commemorative prayers which the Canon contains. They form, though not occurring in unbroken succession, a sequence of their own, and are all that, in the Roman rite, can be regarded as analogous to the "Great Intercession" of the Eastern liturgies.¹

¹ The "Great Intercession" is, I believe, so called only by modern writers. Thus Brightman (*Eastern Liturgies*, p. 578): "*Intercession*, The, or the Great Intercession, the prayer for the whole Church within the Anaphora," and thus distinguished from the Ektene or deacon's litany. "It is a portion of the liturgy which in its extended form is certainly not primitive; and mainly for this reason it holds widely differing positions in the several Eastern rites." This being so, the "great intercession" cannot be regarded as one of the primitive features of the liturgy of the "Apostolic Constitutions." There is, I believe, no ground whatever for assuming, *a priori*, that the Roman Canon ever had a "great intercession" in any other form, so far as structure is concerned, than that which it has, or may be said to have, in the prayers specified above. To speak of it as "scattered throughout the Canon" (Fortescue, p. 329) seems rather a question-begging phrase. (Cf. R. H. Connolly, in *The Tablet*, 1912. i. 864, 865.)

They are as follows:—

- I. "TE IGITUR," &c. A commendation of the Oblata, merging into a prayer for the Pope, the Bishop, and formerly also for the Emperor, and for all the faithful.
- II. "MEMENTO," &c. A prayer for particular persons ("N.N."), living, for all present, and for those on whose behalf the Holy Sacrifice is offered.
- III. "COMMUNICANTES," &c. A commemoration of our Lady and the saints.

And, after the consecration:—

- IV. "MEMENTO ETIAM," &c. A prayer for the deceased ("N.N.").
- V. "NOBIS QUOQUE PECCATORIBUS." A prayer for the celebrant and, perhaps, the sacred ministers, combined with a further commemoration of saints.

Now concerning these prayers, which have fed the devotion of some of us almost since, in early childhood, we were first able to toddle to church, sundry disconcerting statements are made by the most recent critics of the Roman Canon. Here are some of them:

1. We are told that, at the very outset, the word "igitur" ("therefore") is a clear indication that "Te igitur" is out of its place, and that it must originally have followed the consecration with the rest of the "great intercession."¹

¹ Fortescue, p. 328.

2. We are told that, because "Memento" (for the living) and "Memento etiam" for the dead manifestly in some sense belong together, therefore the second must once have followed immediately, or all but immediately, on the first, which is probably true; and moreover that both, as part of the "great intercession," must originally have followed the consecration, which is quite another matter. On this point the testimony of Innocent I. (to be hereafter discussed) is, moreover, invoked.¹

3. We are told that, grammatically speaking, "communicantes" is a participle hanging in the air, and lacking a grammatical subject.²

4. And finally we are told by Dr. Drews that the commemoration of certain saints in the "No-bis quoque peccatoribus" is a "reduplication" or "doublet" of the somewhat similar commemoration in the "Communicantes";³ a doublet, as someone else has said, "derived, no doubt, from another Anaphora."

Now all these observations are, I am inclined to think, rather striking instances of a misapplication of the critical faculty. And the matter deserves very careful consideration in view of the mischief that may be done by needlessly unsettling the minds of unwary students. I would reply:—

1. In the first prayer ("Te igitur") the logical nexus with the foregoing Preface is this. Having said or sung, in the preface, that "it is right

¹ P. 354.

² P. 332.

³ Drews, *apud* Fortescue, p. 161.

and just everywhere and always to *give thanks* to the Father

“THROUGH CHRIST our Lord, . . .

“THROUGH WHOM the Angels *praise Him*,”
&c.,

we go on to say that: “*Therefore* (also)

“THROUGH CHRIST our Lord we suppliantly *beseech Him* that He would deign to bless these gifts,” &c.

To the explanation of the sequence of ideas here indicated I will return presently. Meanwhile, lest there should be any difficulty in seeing a reason for the “*igitur*” in its present place, attention may be called to the rather numerous and remarkably similar clauses which are found here and there in the prefaces of Gallican and Mozarabic Mass-books, of which the following instances may be given:—

“*Te igitur* . . . laudamus, benedicimus,” &c.
(“We praise Thee therefore,” &c.).¹

“*Tibi ergo* . . . immaculatum munus offerimus,” &c. (“We offer Thee therefore,” &c.).²

“*Unde supplices rogamus clementissime Pater*,” &c. (“Wherefore, most benign Father, we beseech Thee,” &c.).³

“*Te ergo quaesumus* . . . sanctifica plebem tuam,” &c. (“We beseech Thee therefore,” &c.).⁴

“*Tuo igitur* nomini offerentes victimam . . .

¹ Neale and Forbes, *The Gallican Liturgy*, p. 142.

² Pp. 110, 201.

³ P. 111.

⁴ P. 222.

rogamus," &c. ("Wherefore, offering this Victim, we pray Thee," &c.).¹

"Per eum *te igitur flagitamus* omnipotens Pater," &c. ("Through Him, therefore, we ask," &c.).²

Examples such as these may serve to weaken the force of Dr. Fortescue's remark (p. 328) that "it certainly does not seem that the *igitur* can be explained in its present place." The compilers of the prefaces from which these clauses are taken obviously perceived, or thought they perceived, a logical connection between the fitness of praising and thanking God and the petitions which they forthwith introduced.

But to return to the analysis given above. By means of it I have endeavoured to emphasize the fact, or what appears to me to be the fact, that the dominant idea throughout is that which is expressed by the words "through Christ our Lord." Through Him we give thanks to the Father, through Him the angels praise the Father, and therefore through Him we rightly address our petition to the Father. In this connection I would call special attention to the emphatic position of "per Christum," &c. in the "*Te igitur*," viz., as near as possible to the beginning of the prayer. And if it should be said that the argument implied in emphasizing the idea expressed in "per Christum,"

¹ *P.L.* lxxxv. 303 (Mozarabic).

² *Ibid.* 188. Cf. *Dublin Review*, Jan. 1894, p. 125. These and other instances were there given in support of a suggestion which I should not now make and which need not be here repeated.

&c., is based on the "praefatio communis" or every-day preface alone, and that it could not be drawn from some of the other prefaces contained in the Roman Missal, my answer would be that the idea, though not always expressed with the same clearness as in the "praefatio communis" is always at least latent. The connection is one of thoughts rather than of words; but we may be thankful that the wording of the preface most commonly in use has been so ordered as to bring the sequence of ideas into full prominence.

But a few words of further explanation are here needed. In all other liturgies, without exception, or rather, in all those which contain the "Sanctus," one or other of the phrases of the "Sanctus" is, or originally was, "subsumed" or taken up and developed in the prayer which immediately follows it.¹ Of this the most obvious example is "Vere sanctus, vere benedictus" ("truly holy and blessed indeed is He," &c.) of the Gallican rite. It might have been expected, then, that in the earliest form of the Roman Canon some similar phrase would be found, whereby the continuity of the Eucharistic prayer (momentarily interrupted by the "Sanctus") should be resumed and carried on. But if only we look a little closely into the matter it will be seen from what has been said above that the Canon as we actually know it has its "subsumption," the phrase and idea taken up being drawn,

¹ *E.g.* Brightman, pp. 19 (Clementine), 51 (Syrian), 125 (Egyptian), 324 (Byzantine).

however, not from the "Sanctus" itself, but, as has just been pointed out, from the body of the preface.¹

2. It is true, of course, and may indeed be described as obviously true, that the Mementos for the living and the dead ("Memento," &c., and "Memento etiam," &c.) do in a sense belong together. But, on the assumption, to be hereafter justified, that these two prayers are in the nature of insertions into a pre-existing text, that they have been transferred to their present places from the offertory, and that in their original position the Mementos for the dead probably followed immediately on that for the living, one or other of various reasons may be suggested for their separation.² Probst suggests that they were separated in order that the Memento for the dead might not be brought into unduly close connection with the commemoration of the saints, as was the case in some at least of the early liturgies. Indeed, a western example of the confusion hence arising occurs in the Stowe Missal; and it was plainly of importance

¹ That the Roman Mass once had a "Vere sanctus" seems to me highly probable. The point will be discussed elsewhere. Meanwhile we are here concerned with the Canon as it stands.

² Whether the separation took place contemporaneously with the transfer, or subsequently thereto, is a point which, in the present state of our knowledge, cannot, I think, be determined. For instances of "Memento defunctorum" following immediately on "Memento vivorum" within the Canon itself, see Ebner, *Quellen*, usw. pp. 405 ff. These instances Ebner regards as reminiscences of the older usage, when both Mementos had their place in the offertory.

that it should be avoided.¹ Or again, it may have been thought more appropriate that the prayer for the dead should follow rather than precede the commemoration of our Lord's own passion and death. Or, lastly, as a mere matter of convenience, it may have seemed well to divide the otherwise somewhat lengthy reading of the diptychs. For there can be no doubt that the names of the persons prayed for (represented by the "N.N." of the Mementos as we know them, were originally read aloud. This last reason would have more force if, as may possibly be the case, the custom had crept in by which the celebrant continued the recital of the Canon while the names were being read. In this case the separation of the Mementos would be precisely analogous to the separation of the Benedictus, as sung by the choir, from the Sanctus, the singing of the Benedictus being usually held over, as we all know, till after the consecration.

3. In order to explain the apparent lack of a subject to support "Communicantes," it is only necessary to bear in mind that, as has been already pointed out, the two Mementos were originally the prayers which accompanied the reading of the diptychs, which no one can suppose to have been a quite primitive custom.² Hence we are not, or

¹ Probst, *Abendl. Messe*, p. 165, MacCarthy, pp. 216 ff. On the "detachability" of the Mementos cf. Cabrol, *apud* Fortescue, pp. 167 f.

² The rubric "Super diptitia," or "s. dyptitia," or "s. dypticia," is found in three sacramentaries described by Ebner (pp. 105, 213, 214), and the first of them has, before "istis et omnibus," the further rubric: "Post lectionem."

ought not to be, greatly surprised to find that, in the Roman Canon, the Memento for the living breaks the grammatical sequence of the prayers between which it has been inserted. In other words, the Memento for the living is to be considered as, in a manner, parenthetic. And the same is to be said of the Memento for the dead, though in this case there is no such obvious interruption of the logical sequence, and no grammatical irregularity. It may be added that the parenthetic character of the Mementos may be more readily understood and recognized if we remember that, at least down to the end of the fourth century, the diptychs were read by the deacon. This is plain from the explicit testimony of St. Jerome, who bitterly complains that deacons in his day curried favour with the rich by not only reading their names, but proclaiming the amount of their offerings.¹ Now, the parenthetic character of the Memento being once understood, it ought to be clear enough to any one who has not a special theory to support, that "Communicantes" does not, after all, lack a subject, which is supplied by the prayer "Te igitur." The construction is: "Offerimus . . . communicantes," *i.e.*, "We offer Thee these gifts . . . in communion with" our Lady and the saints.

¹ "Publiceque in ecclesiis diaconus recitet (? recitat) offerentium nomina: tantum offert illa, tantum ille pollicitus est; placentque sibi ad plausum populi" (*In Ezech.* vi. 18; *P.L.* xxv. 175). How soon this abuse was abolished and the deacons relieved of the office of reading the diptychs, we do not know.

4. There remains one other point to be noticed in connection with the hypothesis, now in favour, that the "great intercession," the very existence of which, at any period in the development of the Roman rite, is more than problematical, once had its rightful place after the consecration. If the Memento for the living, and, as the critics will have it, the "Communicantes" also, had immediately preceded the Memento for the dead and the "Nobis quoque peccatoribus," we should have to account for the awkwardness of a double commemoration of the saints with its two parts in close proximity.¹ It is, indeed, this very awkwardness—arising, not from the present position of the prayers, but from possibly ill-advised attempts at reconstruction—which has led some critics, and formerly led the present writer, to imagine that the commemoration of the saints had been duplicated from two distinct and originally independent sources, which is the last of the four criticisms cited above. A vain imagination, seeing that, as Dr. Fortescue has pointed out, the second list of saints ("John, Stephen," &c.), so far from being a "doublet" of the first, is manifestly intended to supplement it.²

There is, then, nothing in the intercessory portions of the Canon to shake the conviction that, as

¹ Viz. the "Communicantes" itself and the words, "cum Joanne, Stephano" &c. in the "Nobis quoque."

² Fortescue, p. 355. For some particulars, see chap. xv., where a real case of reduplication, as between the Ordinary and the Canon of the Mass, will be pointed out.

I hope to show more clearly in the following chapters, the "scholasticus" of St. Gregory's letter is to be credited with a very perfect piece of work; a compilation, no doubt, in great measure, from earlier and more primitive sources, but deserving to be regarded rather as a beautiful mosaic than as a specimen of patchwork to be picked to pieces by the scissors of the modern critic.

CHAPTER XI.

THE CANON (2).

HAVING analyzed, as regards its structure and the mutual relations of its constituent elements, that part of the Canon of the Mass which consists of intercessory and commemorative prayers, some of which precede and others follow the consecration, we have now to consider what remains of this central portion of the Mass. We shall then be in a position to inquire whether it affords any indications by which we may, with some degree of probability, determine the steps by which its primitive nucleus was, by successive augmentations, brought to its present form.

After the "Communicantes," which, be it observed, ends with the "clausula"—"Per Christum Dominum nostrum. Amen," the "Hanc igitur" resumes the thoughts which have been expressed in the "Te igitur." It echoes the first part of the "Te igitur" in the words "Hanc igitur oblationem . . . accipias" ("Receive, then, this offering"), and it may perhaps be said to reflect its last clause ("et omnibus orthodoxis"—"and all orthodox believers," &c.) in the words "servitutis nostrae . . . *et cunctae familiae tuae*" ("which we Thy servants *together with Thy whole family* make to Thee"). Gifts and givers, says Probst, are

alike commended to God's mercy. And then, on behalf of those who have made their offerings at the Mass, and of all the faithful, a three-fold boon is asked; peace, God's own peace, in this life ("diesque nostros in *tua* pace disponas"), and in the next world deliverance from eternal damnation, and union with the company of the elect.¹ In this last clause we have, of course, an echo of the "Communicantes." This prayer is likewise closed—and this is a point to be noted for future reference—with the words "per Christum Dominum nostrum. Amen."

In the prayer "Quam oblationem" we beg that God will bless the gifts (*i.e.*, the bread and wine), that He will now regard them as inviolably dedicated to His service, that He will ratify the bond thus entered into as between Himself and the offerer, that He will accept them as part of our reasonable service ("benedictam, adscriptam, ratam, rationabilem acceptabilemque facere digneris"); and all this to the end that on our behalf they may be changed and may become the Body and Blood of His most dear Son our Lord Jesus Christ ("ut nobis Corpus et Sanguis fiat dilectissimi Filii tui Domini nostri Jesu Christi"). Here it is to be noted that the prayer has no "conclusion" in the technical sense of the term. Nor is there any need, so far as mere grammar is concerned, for a stop here; though reverence may suggest a suspen-

¹ Cf. Probst, *Abendl. Messe*, pp. 166 f. 249. Probst, however, would connect the "Hanc igitur" more closely with the Memento than I should be disposed to do.

sive pause before "Qui pridie quam pateretur" ("Who, on the day before He suffered"), which forthwith introduces the words of institution and consecration.

Concerning the words of consecration there are several points to be noted. First of all the Roman Canon, followed herein by the Ambrosian, Gallican and old Spanish rites, substitutes the words: "Qui pridie quam pateretur" ("Who, the day before He suffered") for St. Paul's "in qua nocte tradebatur"¹ ("on the night wherein He was betrayed"), which words of the Apostle are retained by all the Eastern liturgies without exception. The use of "Qui pridie," or, as an occasional Gallican variant, "Ipse enim pridie," to introduce the words of consecration is one of the chief among the characteristic features which distinguish all the Western from all the Eastern rites.² Even the Mozarabic, which now has "in qua nocte," &c., unquestionably once had, like the Roman, Ambrosian and Gallican, the introductory formula "Qui pridie." The substitution of this Western form for that of St. Paul's account of the institution, the "Liber Pontificalis" ascribes to Alexander I. (c. 110), nor does there seem to be any good reason for doubting the correctness of the attribution.³ Even were it only ap-

¹ I Cor. xi. 23.

² Lucas in *Dublin Review*, 1894, i. 115; Cagin, *Paléographie Musicale*, v. 55. On this and the statement which follows in the text see chap. xvi.

³ "Hic (sc. Alexander passionem Domini miscuit in pre-catione sacerdotum, quando missae celebrantur" (*P.L.* cxxvii. 1145-7; Duchesne i. 127, with a variant reading). These

proximately true, it would show that already in the early days of the second century the Popes were solicitous about the very words of at least the central portion of what is now—but was not yet called—the Canon.

Moreover, the Roman Canon makes four additions to the words in which the institution of the Holy Eucharist is recorded in the New Testament. In these, likewise, it would seem that the Gallican rite conformed to the Roman type. It is, indeed, impossible to speak with full confidence on this point. For, except in the “*Missa cottidiana Romensis*,” which, of course, has the Roman Canon, the Gallican Masses give only the initial words “*Qui pridie*,” omitting the rest. It is probable, however, that if this had been other than what follows in the Roman Canon, some indication of the discrepancy would have survived.¹

(1) The phrase, occurring twice, *i.e.*, before each consecration, “*in sanctas ac venerabiles manus suas*” (“into His sacred and venerable hands”).

(2) The clause, “*elevatis oculis in coelum ad te Deum Patrem suum omnipotentem*” (“lifting up His eyes towards heaven, to Thee O God His almighty Father”).

words are commonly, and rightly, recognized as having reference to the form “*Qui pridie*.” Duchesne (*l.c.*) speaks, as it seems to me, very inaccurately (c.f. *Dublin Review*, *l.c. note*), and Cagin (*l.c. note 1*), rather hesitatingly on the point.

¹ The text of *M. cottidiana* may be found in *P.L.* lxxii. 454, and, with many interpolations, in the Stowe Missal.

(3) The italicized words in “*hunc praeclarum calicem*” (“*this most excellent chalice*”).

(4) The words “aeterni” and “mysterium fidei” (“the mystery of faith”) in the consecration of the chalice.

Now, considering the emphasis laid by Innocent I. on “the tradition delivered to the Roman Church by St. Peter, the prince of the apostles,” and considering, too, the entire absence of these or any corresponding phrases in the Eastern rites, otherwise so prone to enlargements and expansion, it is perhaps not altogether rash to surmise the possibility that we have here some far-off reminiscence of the very words of the Apostle himself.¹

As everyone who has any acquaintance with the subject is aware, in all the Eastern liturgies, except the early Ethiopic, the words of consecration are followed by an “Anamnesis” or “prayer of remembrance.” To this prayer, as regards both name and place, occasion is given by our Lord’s precept, following immediately on the words of institution: “This do ye in remembrance of Me.” Of course the Gallican liturgy likewise had its anamnesis, though in too many of the prayers which occupy this position in the surviving Gallican Mass-books, the idea of remembrance is either

¹ Cf. an excellent article by the late Dr. J. R. Gasquet, in the *Dublin Review*, July 1890, pp. 86—87. He lays stress, *inter alia*, on the order in which the names of the Apostles occur in “Communicantes,” as possibly indicating the existence of a Roman tradition concerning these chosen followers of our Lord, independent of the lists in the Gospels and Acts.

obscured or has been altogether ousted. Not so, as we know very well, in the Roman Canon, which has its singularly perfect and beautiful anamnesis, viz., the prayer "Unde et memores." It contains not a superfluous word, and is, moreover, full of echoes of the earlier part of the Canon. The prayer runs thus:

"Wherefore, O Lord, we Thy servants and Thy holy people, remembering the blessed passion of the same Christ Thy Son, as also His resurrection from the dead and His glorious ascension into heaven, offer to Thy most excellent Majesty, of Thy gifts and boons, a pure Host, a holy Host, a spotless Host, the holy Bread of eternal life and the Chalice of everlasting salvation."

It is plain that the idea of remembrance is here closely conjoined with that of oblation or sacrifice, and that the sacrificial idea is expressed in terms which recall those of the "Te igitur" and the "Hanc igitur." But, together with points of similarity, a sharp contrast, alike in affirmation and in point of view, is here to be observed. The text deserves the closest scrutiny.

First, then, the words "nos servi tui, sed et plebs tua sancta" ("we Thy servants as also Thy holy people") are manifestly an echo of "servitutis nostrae sed et cunctae familiae tuae" ("of our servanthship as also of all Thy family") occurring in the "Hanc igitur"; and the phrases "de tuis donis ac datis" ("of Thy gifts and boons"), and "hostiam puram, hostiam sanctam, hostiam immacu-

latam " (" a pure Host, a holy Host, a spotless Host ") no less obviously recall the similar but more condensed expressions of the " *Te igitur* "—" *haec dona, haec munera, haec sancta sacrificia illibata* " (" These gifts, these presents, this holy and unspotted sacrifice "). When, however, it is said that in " *Unde et memores* " we find " echoes " of " *Hanc igitur*," the statement must be understood of the text as it now stands. But it is obvious that if there should be independent grounds for thinking that " *Hanc igitur* " is by one stage later than " *Unde et memores* " in the process of the formation of the Canon, then it must be said that " *Hanc igitur*," when it was inserted in the more primitive text, was very skilfully so fashioned as to refer back to the " *Te igitur* " and forwards to " *Unde et memores*."

But now mark the contrast, in idea and in expression, between the prayers that precede and those which follow the consecration. Before the consecration, the oblata, plain bread and wine, mere material things, are our offerings, God's gifts indeed (if such be the true force of the word " *dona* "), but still ours to give back to Him (" *munera* "), and on these our offerings we beg a blessing. But after the consecration they have been transmuted into something very different from mere material objects; they have become " the bread of eternal life and the chalice of everlasting salvation."¹ They are ours indeed, and they

¹ " *Offerimus temporalia, aeterna recipimus*," says an old writer.

are offered once more; but they are no longer ours in the same sense in which they were ours when they were only bread and wine, the property of an individual, which he might have turned to some other use. They are now, in a far higher sense than before, God's gifts (*"de tuis donis ac datis"*) but these gifts are now available for no other use than that of sacrifice. They are no longer in the nature of personal property which might have been otherwise disposed of. They have passed out of our control; in the very act and moment of consecration they have been offered to the Eternal Father by our great High Priest, Jesus Christ; and all that we can now do is to unite our intention with His self-offering.

Accordingly, in the following prayer, *"Supra quae,"* God is asked to regard the offering not merely as *"acceptable"* (the word used before the consecration, in *"Quam oblationem"*) but as *"accepted,"* even as were those of Abel, Abraham and Melchisedech, and (as is implied by the words *"sanctum sacrificium immaculatam hostiam"*) in a higher sense and with a fuller measure of acceptance.¹

It may indeed be objected that we find the expression *"accepta habere"* occurring already in the *"Te igitur,"* but the fact that this is so only serves

¹ The words *"sanctum sacrificium,"* &c., are said to have been added by St. Leo the Great (c. 450). So the *"Liber Pontificalis"* (Duchesne, i. 239, *apud* Fortescue, p. 137). The statement does not occur in *P.L.* cxxviii. 299 ff., the only edition at present accessible to me.

to emphasize, instead of obscuring, the phraseological difference just noted. For in the "Te igitur" we are still in the region and domain of material objects. As such we there asked that the offerings might be "held for accepted." But in the "Quam oblationem" we beg that, by virtue of the consecration, they may be rendered "acceptable" on, so to say, a higher plane. And on this higher plane we ask in "Unde et memores" that the consecrated elements may be "held for accepted." It is only in the light of the Catholic dogma of transubstantiation that the words of the Canon can be fully appreciated or even rightly understood.

Then in the prayer "Supplices te rogamus," we ask, using a bold and dramatic figure of speech to express a sublime truth, that by the ministry of an Angel, the sacrifice may be carried to the heavenly altar, the altar of which we read in the Apocalypse, and there presented to the Divine Majesty; to the end that all who from this material altar (which the celebrant here kisses) shall receive the Body and Blood of Christ may be filled with all heavenly blessings and graces. Here follows, again be it noted, the conclusion: "Per eundem Christum Dominum nostrum. Amen."

Concerning the Memento for the dead and the "Nobis quoque peccatoribus," nothing need here be said beyond noting that each of these prayers has the "clausula," "Per Christum," &c., but that the second of them has no "Amen." Instead of "Amen," there follows an expansion or enlarge-

ment of the "Per Christum," &c., in the following terms: "Through whom, O Lord, Thou dost ever create, hallow, quicken, bless, and bestow on us all these good things."

But what are "all these good things"? There seems to be little doubt that these words originally had reference, inclusively but not exclusively, to the offerings, other than those of the bread and wine for the sacrifice, which in early days were made after the Gospel; and that they continued to have this application to material objects, at least inclusively, when, far down into the Middle Ages, a lamb was brought to be blessed on St. Agnes' day, January 21st, the first-fruits of the harvest on Ascension Day, and those of the vintage on the feast of St. Xystus, August 6th.¹

And then the theme with which the preface began ("We thank Thee through Christ our Lord") and ended ("The angels praise Thee, and we with them, through Christ our Lord"), the theme which the Canon carried on from its commencement ("We beseech Thee through Christ our Lord"), and which is echoed again and again in the conclusion ("per Christum," &c.) of precisely five of its prayers,—this theme receives its final and comprehensive development in what may deservedly and with all reverence be called the solemn finale of the Canon—

"Through Him, and with Him, and in Him is

¹ Or, as we learn from contemporary witnesses, on a later day in case a dull summer had delayed the ripening of the grapes (Bona, II. xiv. 5; cf. Fortescue, p. 358).

to Thee, God the Father almighty, in the unity of the Holy Ghost, all honour and glory

“For ever and ever.¹ R. Amen.”

Here, as we all know, at “per omnia saecula saeculorum,” the priest raises his voice, and the response is made by the choir, or, in a Low Mass, by the clerk. This is the final “Amen” at the close of the great Eucharistic prayer, to which St. Justin, in his description of the Mass as celebrated in the second century, so pointedly calls attention.²

¹ Cf. Rom. xi. 36; I Cor. viii. 6.

² See above, chap. ix.

CHAPTER XII.

THE CANON (3).

I HAVE already expressed the conviction that there is no sufficient ground for the opinion, too confidently held as it seems to me by some modern writers, that in the interval of about three centuries and a half which elapsed between the time of St. Justin (c. 150) and that of Gelasius (c. 490) the Roman Canon underwent a wholesale transposition of its parts, with the result that it must now be regarded as a patchwork of somewhat ill-assorted and ill-arranged fragments. All that we know of the actual history of the liturgy during the period in question, though that is little enough, should, I think, lead us to believe that in Rome, or at any rate in the principal churches of the holy city, no change was ever made in the text of the Canon without Papal authority, and that the Popes themselves were, to say the least, slow to make or to authorize such changes. That it was far otherwise in regions where, under the circumstances of the times, the authority of the Pope in liturgical matters could not be effectively exercised, may be seen from the vagaries of the early Gallican Mass-books, one of which has a Mass entirely composed, down to the "Qui pridie," in verse. And that the abuse of unauthorized interpolations long survived

the adoption, in substance, of the Roman rite, appears, to cite no other instances, from the text of the Stowe Missal as re-cast by Moel Caich, and from a strong passage in the "Micrologus."¹

There is obviously a very wide difference between an orderly and gradual expansion carried out under authority, and a more or less subversive and revolutionary—not to say arbitrary—transposition of the principal parts of the Canon. That augmentations, transpositions, substitutions, all made by authority, were possible, we know from what we are told of the liturgical changes carried out, on a very restricted scale, by St. Gregory the Great. But no change under any one of these three heads must be assumed to have taken place unless there are really strong grounds for believing that it actually did take place. For such indications we have now to seek; and the following I believe to be a complete list of them:

1. It has been already seen that the Memento for the living so interrupts the grammatical sequence as between "Te igitur" and "Communicantes," that it may fairly be regarded as an inserted paragraph. This is altogether in accordance with what we should expect; for a prayer for the Pope and prelates and the faithful in general, such as we have in the "Te igitur," would by the nature

¹ Cf. *P.L.* cxxxviii. 876; MacCarthy, pp. 140—233; Probst, *op. cit.* 43; and *P.L.* cli. 985. The "Micrologus" is a liturgical treatise (c. 1050—1100) of uncertain authorship, unless indeed Don G. Morin's ascription of the tract to Bernold of Constance is to be accepted or established (*Revue Benedictine* viii. 335 ff. *apud* Fortescue p. 195 note).

of things have found a place in the liturgy long before the custom arose of making public mention of particular persons (benefactors, &c.) other than those who were entitled *ex officio* to be thus named. And the same, *mutatis mutandis*, would hold good of the Memento for the dead, which must also have been inserted, or substituted for an earlier form of more general import, in a pre-existing text. The circumstance that the two Mementos are (apparently) connected by "etiam" ("also"), and that the first lacks the "conclusion" ("per Christum," &c.), which the second has, must also be taken into account. It has been already assumed, in chapter x., that the Mementos were, probably at some time in the fourth century, transferred from the offertory. This assumption appears to me to be justified by the undoubted fact that in the Gallican rite, and therefore by inference in the earlier Roman rite from which the Gallican was derived, the "Nomina" were proclaimed just before the prayer which corresponds to the Roman *secreta*.¹ The fact that "Communicantes" has its own "conclusion" is an indication, I believe, that if the two Mementos were thus transferred, "Communicantes" was not transferred with them, and that it stands on a quite different footing.

2. Having in view the primitive continuity of the Eucharistic prayer, there is, I think, a presumption to the effect that those sections of the Canon which end with "Amen" are of a somewhat

¹ On the relation between the Gallican and the Roman liturgies, see chap. xvi.

less early date than those in which the transition to the section next following is made without any break in the sense. This consideration would lead us to believe, what is obviously probable on other grounds, that the prayer "Communicantes" does not belong to the fundamental stratum of the Canon. And it seems entirely reasonable to suppose that "Hanc igitur," which also has its "Amen," and which resumes "Te igitur" after the break caused by "Memento" and "Communicantes," had no place in the Canon until this break had been made by at least the latter of these two prayers. As for "Nobis quoque," which has the "conclusion" ("per Christum," &c.), though not the "Amen," at first sight it undoubtedly seems to postulate the previous Memento, and consequently to be of contemporary or possibly of later introduction. For to connect it with the end of the preceding prayer, "Supplices," involves the awkwardness of coupling, by means of the word "also," two clauses both of which are in the first person plural. In other words, it seems strange, after praying that "those of us" who shall have received the Holy Sacrament may be abundantly blessed, forthwith to ask that "to us also" (as well as to "those of us" who shall have communicated) may be granted the fellowship of the saints. Yet we may well learn caution from the fact that several MSS. of the Gregorianum have no Memento for the dead at this point.¹ For, what-

¹ Ebner, *Quellen*, usw. pp. 405 ff.

ever the explanation of the fact may be, it at least serves to show that no incongruity was perceived in joining "Nobis quoque" to the end of "Supplices." The explanation would seem to be that "quotquot sumpserimus" ("those of us who shall have received," &c.) is regarded as equivalent to a clause in the third person plural ("those who shall have received"), while the "we" or "us" of the "Nobis quoque" has reference to the celebrant only, and is thus, equivalently, in the first person singular. I am confirmed in thinking that "Nobis quoque" is contemporary with "Communicantes" by the manifestly supplementary character of the list of saints who are enumerated in the second of the two prayers. To this point I shall have occasion to recur in Chapter xv.

Lastly, the "Amen" at the end of the prayer "Supplices," indicating as it does that the primitive continuity of the Eucharistic prayer has here again been broken, gives some confirmation to a surmise, resting on independent grounds, that an "Epiklesis" or invocation of the Holy Spirit once had its place here, and that "Supplices," &c., has been substituted for it.

The question as to the Epiklesis is too large to be discussed here, and such a discussion hardly falls within the scope of this book. Since, however, it is commonly and with high probability held that the Roman rite once included an invocation of the Holy Spirit similar to those which are found in the Eastern liturgies, it seems desirable that a brief statement on the subject should find its place

here. The facts would seem to be, roughly speaking, as follows:—

1. The epiklesis in its fully developed form was an invocation to the Holy Spirit to change the elements of bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ.

2. The epiklesis, at least in this form, was almost certainly not primitive. Indeed the earliest extant testimony seems to indicate that even so late as the end of the third century this prayer was still in process of formation and fixation. Thus Serapion's liturgy has, after the words of institution, an invocation, not to the Holy Spirit but to the Divine Word, to "make the bread His Body,"¹ &c. On the other hand an ancient liturgical fragment recently discovered among the ruins of the monastery of Balyeh, near Siout, in Upper Egypt, and described in great detail by Dom P. Puniet, has, *before* the words of institution, an invocation of the Holy Spirit, who is prayed "to make the bread the Body of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ."² Whether Father Puniet is right in his conjecture that this was the original position of the epiklesis in the Alexandrian rite I will not venture to affirm. But the very fact that the epiklesis did not at first

¹ Funk, *Didascalia*, ii. 174 ff. Rauschen, *Florilegium Patristicum*, vii. 28, cites from a fragment of St. Athanasius a statement that, at the time of "the great prayers," "the Word descends on the bread, and it becomes the Body" of Christ.

² Puniet, in the *Record of the XIXth Eucharistic Congress*, pp. 383 ff.

uniformly hold the same position, seems to me to point to the conclusion that it was in the nature of an addition to the primitive Anaphora. And this conclusion is confirmed by the Epiklesis of the Ethiopic Ordinances. Here it follows the words of institution, but its purport is to implore that the Holy Spirit would render the offerings profitable for holiness to those who receive them.¹ So that the diversities of usage concerned, (*a*) the Divine Person invoked, (*b*) the nature of the petition, and (*c*) its place in the liturgy.

3. In some form, and in some position, usually after the words of institution, it would seem to have become common to all liturgies, at an early stage of their development.

4. Its insertion, or perhaps we should rather say, the position which it finally came to hold, may possibly have been suggested by the appropriateness of introducing, after the "remembrance" of the resurrection and ascension, some reference to the work of the Holy Spirit.

5. The occurrence of the verbs *ἀναδείκνυναι* and *ἀποφάινειν* ("to show") in sundry forms of the epiklesis, may perhaps be thought to point back to a time when the office which the Holy Spirit was implored to fulfil was that of manifesting to us the divine gift rather than that of effecting the consecration. It is, however, clear beyond dispute that, whatever its original purport may have been, the epiklesis, in course of time, came to be com-

¹ Funk, *Didascalia*, ii. 100.

monly understood as a petition that the Holy Spirit would affect the change of the elements. And the same character it plainly has in some at least of the Western examples which survive or are preserved in Gallican and Mozarabic prayers "post Pridie." And since the persuasion that the consecration was effected by the epiklesis involved, or was commonly understood to involve, a denial of the consecrating efficacy of the words of institution, the Council of Florence, in 1439, explicitly defined the sufficiency of the words of institution to effect the transubstantiation of the elements, and condemned any error to the contrary. In view, then, of the manifest danger of such errors, it is plain that there was, at a much earlier date, good and sufficient reason for substituting another prayer for the epiklesis, or changing the invocation into the form ("Supplices te rogamus," &c.), which it now has in the Roman rite. In view of the fact that Gelasius, in a fragment of a letter which has been preserved, makes an explicit reference to an epiklesis as then in use, it is at least possible that it was he who made the substitution or change.¹

The following scheme will indicate what appear to me to have been, most probably, the successive steps of a gradual and orderly development of the Roman Canon from its nucleus. In the first column it has seemed well to give, besides the initial words,

¹ On the whole subject see Fortescue, art. "Epiklesis" in the *Cath. Encycl.* v. 502 f., where abundant references will be found.

enough to indicate the general meaning and purport of the several prayers.

First Stage.	Augments (I.)	Augments (II.)
TE IGITUR . . . rogamus ut . . . sacrificia . . . accipias . . . quae offeri- mus pro Ecclesia . . . Papa . . . fidelitū . . .		MEMENTO (pro vivis).
QUAM OBLATIONEM . . . acceptabilem facere dig- neris, ut Corpus et San- guis fiat D.N.J.C.	COMMUNICANTES, &c. HANC IGITUR, &c.	
QUI PRIDIE quam patere- tur, &c. (Sequuntur verba consecratoria). Haec quotiescumque, &c.		
UNDE ET MEMORES . . . passionis . . . resurrec- tionis . . . ascensionis, offerimus . . . panem vitae . . . et calicem salutis.		
SUPRA QUAE . . . respi- cere digneris . . . [eaeque] accepta habere. . . .		
[? EPIKLEISIS.]	SUPPLICES, &c.	MEMENTO ETIAM (pro defunctis).
	NOBIS QUOQUE.	
PER QUEM haec omnia . . . benedicas, &c.		
PER IPSUM, &c.		
AMEN.		

While however it has seemed desirable on the one hand to vindicate the Roman Canon from the charge of being a mere patchwork of materials not too skilfully pieced together, and while it has seemed worth while to make an attempt, guided by definite indications, to trace its orderly growth from an assignable nucleus, it must on the other hand be admitted that even this nucleus, or rather

that portion of it which precedes the consecration (*i.e.*, the "Te igitur" and "Quam oblationem") is not in the highest sense primitive. Neither St. Justin's description, nor the rudimentary liturgy of the Ethiopic Church Ordinances, give any hint of intercessory petitions as forming part of the great Eucharistic prayer. Or rather, there is no hint of any other petition except that which in the Ethiopic form of this prayer is, as has been seen, addressed to the Holy Spirit, praying Him to make the Holy Eucharist efficacious for salvation and sanctification to those who received it. In the primitive liturgy the intercessory petitions would seem to have all had their place before the commencement of the great "act" of thanksgiving and consecration. Thus, when St. Justin describes the intercessory prayers which follow the lessons as "put up" by the congregation (and thereby distinguished from the Eucharistic prayer which is put up by the celebrant alone), we must suppose that the petitions formed a kind of litany, to the successive clauses of which the people responded.

The statement just made about St. Justin's testimony requires perhaps a word of justification, the more so as on this point I cannot see my way to agree with Dr. Fortescue. The facts, as pointed out by Dom R. H. Connolly are these.¹ St. Justin uses the following expressions (and none other) in describing the great Eucharistic prayer offered by the celebrant after the people have "sent up their petitions."

¹ Connolly in *The Tablet*, 1912, i. 864 B.

(1) He “ sends up *praise* and *glory* and *thanksgiving*.”¹

(2) After he has finished the *prayers* and *thanksgiving*, the people answer: “ Amen.”²

(3) He “ sends up *prayers* together with *thanksgiving*.”³

Father Connolly is surely right in contending that the only “ prayers ” here referred to “ are prayers of praise, not of intercession.” And even were it to be contended that the word “ prayers ” must needs imply intercession, it at least cannot be urged that the phrases “ prayer and thanksgiving ” and “ prayers together with thanksgiving ” imply that the thanksgiving came first, and was *followed*, as in the “ Clementine ” liturgy, by the alleged intercessory supplication. This is a point well and strongly urged by Father Connolly, who seems to be abundantly justified in rendering “ *εὐχὰς ὁμοίως καὶ εὐχαριστίας* ”—“ prayers and *likewise* thanksgivings,” *i.e.*, “ prayers *together with* thanksgiving,” and not, as Dr. Fortescue translates the phrase,—“ prayers *in the same way* [*i.e.*, in the same way as the people had done] and thanksgiving.” Father Connolly has, I think, made it clear beyond reasonable doubt that it is a mistake to give to “ *ὁμοίως καὶ* ” a retrospective meaning.

¹ *Apol.* i. 65 (abridged).

² *Ibid.* “ Immediately afterwards, referring back ” to the praise and thanksgiving previously mentioned, “ he describes them as ‘ the prayers and the thanksgiving ’ ” (Connolly).

³ *Apol.* i. 67 (“ *preces una cum gratiarum actionibus*,” Rauschen).

Nor is it from St. Justin and the Church Ordinances alone that we may draw a probable conclusion to the effect that "Te igitur" and "Quam oblationem" have displaced, in the Roman rite, an earlier form of what, for convenience may henceforth be spoken of as the "Post Sanctus." It has already been observed that the "Sanctus," with its accompanying "Benedictus," did not, on its first introduction into the Anaphora, so entirely break the continuity of the latter as at first sight it seems to do in the Mass as we know it. In every extant liturgy which contains the Sanctus and Benedictus, with the sole exception of the Roman and Romanized Ambrosian, the prayer which immediately follows forthwith takes up and develops, in one way or another, the words of the acclamation. Thus, in the early Gallican rite, the "Post Sanctus" most commonly, though by no means invariably, begins with the words "Vere sanctus, vere benedictus" (*i.e.*, "Holy indeed, and truly blessed," &c.), and proceeds without interruption to the "Qui pridie." The point is of sufficient importance to deserve illustration by means of a typical example from a Gallican Mass. The Mass, it will be observed, is of the Epiphany.

Collectio Post Sanctus.

"Holy indeed and truly blessed is our Lord Jesus Christ who, to make manifest His Divine generation, on this day bestowed on the world these wonders of His majesty, to wit, the star which He showed to the Magi, the conversion—after an in-

terval of time—of water into wine, and the hallowing of the waters of Jordan by His baptism.

“ Who, the day before He suffered,” &c.¹

The very form of this particular prayer is enough to illustrate the truth that in the Gallican liturgy the “ post Sanctus ” varied—as did also the “ post Pridie ” or “ post Mysterium ”—with the season and the feast. It is not suggested that this was ever the case in Rome. But bearing in mind what I cannot but regard as the all but demonstrable fact of the distinctively Roman origin of the Gallican rite, and taking account also of the plainly analogous yet no less distinctively dissimilar character of the “ post Sanctus ” in the Eastern liturgies, it seems to me impossible to resist the conclusion that the original Roman “ post Sanctus ” must have closely resembled the Gallican; and that the probabilities are almost overwhelmingly in favour of the hypothesis that it began with the very words “ Vere sanctus, vere benedictus.”² For it is not easy to suppose that the churches of

¹ *P.L.* lxxii. 243.

² *Dublin Review*, Jan. 1894, pp. 121—122; Cagin, *Paléogr. Musicale*, v. 71. All the liturgies agree in taking up the words of the Sanctus, but they do so in characteristically different ways. The “ Clementine ” and Byzantine have, in substance: “ Holy indeed and all-holy art Thou . . . and Holy is Thy Only-begotten Son ” (Brightman, pp. 19, 324, 385, 403). The Antiochene family give to the Sanctus an emphatically Trinitarian sense, thus, in substance: “ Holy is the Father, Holy the Son, Holy the Holy Spirit ” (pp. 51, 86). The Egyptian or Alexandrian family on the other hand take up and expand the phrase: “ Full are the heavens and the earth of Thy glory ” (pp. 132, 176, 232).

Lombardy, Spain, Gaul and Ireland would all have independently hit upon this particular and characteristic form of words; whereas if the phrase "Vere sanctus, vere benedictus" were of Roman origin, its use throughout the Western church would find its most obvious explanation.¹ The one weak point in the argument, merely as regards this highly specialized verbal formula, lies in the fact that the "post Sanctus" in the Gallican books does not, after all, invariably begin with the words "Vere sanctus."²

¹ The Ambrosian Missal, which now has the Roman Canon, nevertheless to this day retains, in the Mass for Holy Saturday, a section commencing "Vere sanctus," awkwardly intercalated after the "Te igitur." But in at least two early MSS. of the Ambrosian rite, the "Vere sanctus" in the Mass of that day holds its original position as the sole connecting link between the Sanctus and the Qui pridie (Duchesne, *Origines du Culte*, pp. 205-6, and, with fuller details, Cagin, *Paléogr. Musicale*, v. 60 ff.). And in the same MSS. there are relics, hardly less unmistakable, of the Gallican post Sanctus and post Pridie in the Mass for Maundy Thursday (Cagin, l.c.). The Stowe Missal has one clear instance (MacCarthy, p. 228) of a Gallican "Vere Sanctus"; besides which it has a similar section commencing "Benedictus qui venit" (p. 207), abbreviated, as MacCarthy shows, from a fuller "Vere Sanctus." This is so contrived as to lead up to "Te igitur"; which is obviously a conflate arrangement. Cagin, p. 69, mentions the first of these, but seems to have overlooked the second. He refers, however, to another Celtic fragment, discovered by H. B. Swete, similar to the first. On the Mozarabic and Gallican books see the following note.

² As the point does not seem to have been observed, precisely in this connection, before (though many of the instances have been given, for another purpose, by Cagin, pp. 58, 59), it may be well to give a list of the variants which I have noted. They occur in a considerable proportion of the 45 Masses which alone are available for comparison.

I. The Reichenau MS. (*P.L.* cxxxviii. 365 ff.). Nos. 3

Whatever be the case, however, as regards the initial words of the original Roman "post Sanctus," it is, I think, safe to conclude that neither it nor the original Roman "post Pridie" (or Anamnesis *plus* Epiklesis) had a markedly intercessory character. The intercessory portion of the primitive liturgy would seem to have been exclusively pre-anaphoral. This, at any rate, is the impression produced by St. Justin's description and by the liturgy of the Church Ordinances. But, when once the unbroken continuity of the great Eucharistic prayer had been interrupted by the "Sanctus," an instinct which, because so universal, must be held to have been sound, would seem

"Benedictus," &c.; 4, "Deus qui nos," &c.; 5, "Hic inquam Christus," &c.; 6, "Hanc in excelsis," &c.; 8, Unde terribilis, sanctus," &c.

II. "Missale Gothicum" (*P.L.* lxxii. 225 ff.). Nos. 4, "Gloria," &c.; 20, "Suscipe," &c.; 27, "Haec est sine fine felicitas," &c.; 36, "Tuo jussu," &c.; 37, "Haec te nos," &c.; 49, "Hanc igitur," &c. (but this, of course, is Roman, and borrowed); 64, "Oremus dilectissimi," &c.; 65 and 80, "Hosanna," &c.; 78, "Sanctus in Sanctis," &c.; 79, "Per quem deprecemur," &c.

III. "Missale Gallicanum" (*ibid.* 339 ff.). Nos. 1, "Benedictus plane," &c.; 4, "Hanc igitur" (Roman); 15, "Aspice," &c.; 17, "Te igitur" (Roman).

In view of these instances we must, I think, recognize the possibility that the form "Vere sanctus, vere benedictus," notwithstanding its constant occurrence in the Mozarabic Missal as revised by Card. Ximenes (*P.L.* lxxxv. 109 ff.) may, after all, be in the nature of a "survival of the fittest" among many competing forms. But this admission does not affect the argument from the general character of the Gallican post Sanctus, which (with the "Qui pridie") must surely have been derived, ultimately, from Rome.

to have led to the introduction of intercessory prayers into the Anaphora itself.

And hence arose a kind of duplication which in a somewhat ponderous form is found to lengthen out unduly the Eastern liturgies. For in them the prayers described by St. Justin as put forth by the whole congregation, developed into the "Diakonika" or "Synapté" or "Ectené" which followed the Gospel; and the same ideas and petitions are expanded with hardly less prolixity in the great intercession which forms so large a portion of the Eastern Anaphora. But the Roman rite, in the course of its development, would seem to have skilfully avoided this ponderous duplication.¹ Nor is there, I think, any evidence at all to show that the intercessory portion of the Roman Canon was ever other than relatively short. And the substitution of "Te igitur," with its reference back to the body of the Preface, for the earlier "post Sanctus" with its subsumption of the Sanctus only, was as skilful a method as could have been devised for introducing the intercessory element into this central portion of the Mass, and at the same time preserving the essential continuity of the latter.

There is then, I believe, no serious reason for maintaining that the "Te igitur" and what follows it was transferred, whether textually or in sub-

¹ That there is a certain duplication as between Offertory and Canon in the present Roman rite has been pointed out in vol. i. chap. vii. p. 109. But this is due to the intrusion of Gallican elements into the simpler Gregorian rite.

stance, either from a position subsequent to the consecration, or, as I was formerly disposed to think, from the offertory. At the utmost it may with some approach to certainty be held that the Mementos, as prayers for particular persons, once had their place, in the Roman as in the early Gallican rite, before the preface. This however, is to be understood, of course, not of the verbal text of these prayers, but only of their general purport.

CHAPTER XIII.

THE CANON (4).

IT may perhaps seem strange, and hardly in accord with the sound principles of sound criticism (to use the word in its best and most legitimate sense), to have devoted so much space to the internal evidence, such as it is, supplied by the Canon itself as to the successive stages of its development, before even touching, except in the case of St. Justin's account of the liturgy, on the external testimony which bears, or may be thought to bear, on the subject. But for two reasons I have deliberately adopted this course. For, first, in this particular instance, the internal evidence appears to me to be, I dare not say clearer and more abundant, but at least less obscure and scanty than the external. And secondly, since the words of the Canon of the Mass form part, and in a sense incomparably the best part, of our daily vocal prayer, it seemed more profitable and helpful to concentrate the reader's attention on its structure and purport, rather than to distract his thoughts with the consideration of historical problems, which for him, perhaps, may have little of living interest.

The historical evidence cannot, however, be passed over in silence, and I proceed to summarize it as briefly as possible, looking backwards from

what is clear and certain to the obscurity of the remoter past.

1. In the first place then it is certain that the Canon as we know it has come down to us unchanged from the days of St. Gregory the Great.¹ On this point there is, of course, no room for dispute or discussion.

2. Secondly, it is for practical purposes certain that the changes introduced by St. Gregory into the Canon were, relatively speaking, small. They consisted, in fact, in the transfer of the "Pater noster" from its old position after the Fraction to that which it now holds,² and in the addition, or perhaps the fixing, of the formula "diesque nostros," &c., as the termination of the prayer "Hanc igitur." John the Deacon says that he "added" these words.³ It would probably have been more correct to say that he substituted them for certain variant endings, such as are found, to the number of four or five, in the Leonianum, and such as probably occurred more frequently in the original text of the Gelasianum.⁴

¹ The addition of the "Agnus Dei" by Pope Sergius I. (c. A.D. 700) lies, of course, outside the Canon. Nor is there any need to linger on certain interpolations in the Gregorian Canon which are found in many mediaeval MSS., but which were finally ruled out of court. Cf. Ebner, *passim*.

² See below, chap. xiv.

³ *Vita Greg. Mag.* in *P.L.* lxxv. 94.

⁴ All the variants in the extant MSS. of the Gelasianum conclude with the words "diesque nostros," &c. But this may probably be the result of that process of "Gregorianizing," which even the earliest of these MSS. have undergone.

3. Going back more than fifty years from St. Gregory, we have the clear and explicit testimony of Pope Vigilius (c. 540), writing to Bishop Pro-futurus of Braga, that in his time the text of the Roman Canon ("ipsius canonicae precis textus") was fixed, admitting only of minor variant clauses on particular festivals.¹

4. Although we are not told that St. Gelasius (c. 490) made any change in the Canon, yet the superscription "Canon dominicus Papae Gilasi," occurring in the Stowe Missal,² makes it necessary to take account of the possibility that he may be the author of any alteration in the order or wording of the prayers which can, on independent grounds, be proved to have been made about his time. Such would be, for instance, the elimination or modification of the epiklesis, now represented by the prayer "Supplices te rogamus," &c.³ The superscription in question does not, of course, imply that the scribe believed Gelasius to have been the author of the Canon as a whole. At the utmost it implies a tradition that this Pope had in some way modified the text.

¹ "Cognoscite . . . nos semper eodem tenore oblata Dei munera consecrare." But on great festivals "singula capitula diebus apta subjungimus" (*P.L.* lxix. 18; cf. Fortescue, p. 135). These "capitula" would be of the same nature as the variant clauses in the "Communicantes" and "Hanc igitur" which have survived in our Missals, but more numerous.

² MacCarthy, p. 219.

³ See above, p. 46.

5. And in fact, when we go back to the earlier half of the fifth century we find what, by Dr. Fortescue and others, have been deemed to be clear indications that, if it was not effected by St. Gelasius himself, a notable re-arrangement of the parts of the Canon must have taken place in the interval. The writers referred to do not lay any undue stress on Pope Boniface's assurance (c. 420) to the Emperor Honorius that intercession is made for him "inter mysteria," *i.e.*, within the Canon or "Action" of the Mass.¹ But when Celestine I. (c. 430), under similar circumstances, informs Theodosius that he is prayed for, by name, "oblatis sacrificiis," *i.e.*, "after the offering of the sacrifice,"² this testimony is regarded as all but conclusive in favour of the hypothesis that the "great intercession" formerly followed the consecration; and that its present "scattered" condition is due to the transfer of a portion of it to its present place. Yet it may be doubted whether anyone would have thought of basing a serious argument on this expression were it not for a far more weighty piece of testimony which must presently be examined. Meanwhile I may express my own belief that Celestine's expression, "oblatis sacrificiis" are nothing

¹ *Ep. ad Honorium*, P.L. xx. 767. "Ecce enim inter ipsa mysteria, inter preces suas quas pro vestra felicitate defundit imperii; . . . ; cum sollicita petitione miscetur oratio ne nos . . . semel evulsa distrahat a cultu solito . . . discordia." It is just possible that these last words contain an allusion to the words "diesque nostros in tua pace," &c., of the "Hanc igitur."

² *Ep. ad Theodosium*, P.L. l. 544.

but an echo of the words "*haec sancta sacrificia illibata . . . quae tibi offerimus*" (in the "*Te igitur*," where the Emperor's name was mentioned after that of Pope); and that they do not specifically refer to the consecration as such.

6. The more important testimony just referred to is of course the famous letter of Innocent I. (c. 410) to Bishop Decentius of Gubbio. Gubbio is a city of Umbria, some twenty miles east of Perugia, and not so remote from Milan but that the bishop might be expected to know the Milanese practice, or even the Gallican, almost as well as he knew the Roman. He had written to the Pope to ask, among other things, whether the names "of those who had made offerings" (note the limitation) should be proclaimed before the Canon ("*antequam precem sacerdos faciat*"), or later. Innocent's answer, partly to the letter in general, and partly to this particular question, is to the following effect:

"If all bishops would observe in their integrity the apostolic traditions, there would be no diversities of ritual. But when everyone thinks himself at liberty to do what seems good in his own eyes without regard to tradition, such diversities inevitably arise, to the scandal of the faithful.

"What was delivered by St. Peter the prince of the Apostles to the Roman Church should be observed by all, nor should anything be added to or interpolated therein ('*superduci aut introduci*') except under authority, nor should any example be followed but that of Rome, from which the

churches of Italy, Gaul, Spain, Africa and Sicily had their origin.

"As to the particular question concerning the proclamation of the names before the prex ('antequam precem sacerdos faciat'), and before *the celebrant has by his prayer* ('oratione') *commended to God the gifts of those whose names are to be announced* [which is precisely what is done in the "Te igitur"], you yourself will see how superfluous it is to bring in ('insinues') the name of him whose oblation you have not yet presented to God, as though He did not know it ('quamvis illi incognitum sit nihil'). First then the oblata are to be *commended to God* [as they are in the "Te igitur"], and then the names of those who have made the offerings are to be proclaimed ('edicenda'); so that they are to be named 'inter sacra mysteria' (i.e., within the sacrificial action) and not in the course of what precedes it, *that by the mysteries themselves we may open a way for the prayers that are to follow* ('ut ipsis mysteris viam futuris precibus aperiamus')."¹

Now if anyone will carefully examine this passage, and will compare it with the analysis of the Canon which has been given in Chapter x., or better still, with the text of the Canon itself, he can hardly fail to see how exactly the concluding paragraph, with the possible exception of the last clause of all, describes the actual position of the

¹ *P.L.* xx. 552—554. It is to be remembered that the offertory prayers, now said by the priest after the Gospel, then had no place in the liturgy. See vol. i. chap. vii.

Memento for the living. It is by the "Te igitur," and not by any prayer that follows the consecration, that the oblata are "commended to God." After the consecration they have become God's gifts, which are no longer in any human sense ours. We could not, if we would, now withdraw them; they have ceased to be what the offerer originally presented. And the force of this consideration should make us hesitate to understand the last clause of all in any sense inconsistent with what has been said. Nor is it indeed necessary so to press "*ipsa mysteria*" ("the mysteries themselves") as if the phrase necessarily pointed specifically to the consecration. The whole of the action is designated by the term "*mysteria*," which could likewise be used, without impropriety, of that part of the action with which the writer of the letter has been concerned. Indeed, Innocent himself, in a later paragraph of the letter, reminds Decentius that on so sacred and secret a theme, he must needs speak guardedly and obscurely. He writes: "*Verba . . . dicere non possum, ne magis prodero videar quam ad consultationem respondere*," *i.e.*, he will not quote the very words of a sacramental prayer lest he should seem to be revealing secrets rather than answering a question.¹ The allusion is of course to the "*disciplina arcani*," the "*discipline of the secret*," then in full force.²

But now, because some of my readers may after all be disposed to hold, with Dr. Fortescue, that

¹ *P.L.* xx. 555. Cf. Probst, *Abendl. Messe*, p. 148.

² Cf. vol. i. p. 52.

there is a clear and unmistakable reference to the consecration in the Pope's words about "opening the way for prayers which are to follow by the mysteries themselves," it is important to notice that Innocent says nothing at all, either explicitly or by implication, about a "great intercession," and that both question and answer have to do, not with "names" in general (including, for instance, those of the Pope, the Bishop, and formerly the Emperor, occurring in the "Te igitur"), but exclusively about *the names of the particular persons whose offerings entitled them to be prayed for*. In other words, all that he says has reference to what, since the public recitation of names has been suppressed, we now call the "Memento for the living." And consequently, if his concluding expression is to be understood as implying that the "names" of which he speaks are to be read after the consecration, this will simply mean that in Innocent's time the Memento for the living immediately preceded the Memento for the dead. In any case (and this is the important point) he is not speaking of the "Te igitur" or "Communicantes" or of anything corresponding thereto.

In illustration of this statement it may be worth while to call attention to a passage in the seventh of the "Ordines Romani," which deals with the ritual of the Lenten "Scrutinies." It is here explicitly directed that, after the Gospel, an offering should be made by the parents or sponsors of the candidates for baptism, the "electi," as they are called, and then it is further directed that in the

Memento for the living the names of the sponsors are to be recited, and those of the "electi" in the "Hanc igitur." Here, surely, is a clear illustration, all the better for being quite incidental, of what is meant by the "nomina offerentium" in Innocent's letter.¹

Perhaps, then, enough has been said to convince the reader that the instructions given by Innocent I. to Decentius of Gubbio afford no support whatever to the advocates of the hypothesis that the present condition of the Roman Canon is due to a subversive transference of the larger portion of an alleged "great intercession" from its supposedly original position after the consecration.

Of the very interesting quotation from the Canon of the Mass which is found in the Ambrosian tract "de Sacramentis," it must be enough to say that it bears witness to the existence, in the writer's time, of that portion of the Canon which extends from "Quam oblationem" to the end of the prayer, "Supra quae."² That the quoted passage shows sundry variants from the text as we know it, and that the two prayers "Unde et memores" and "Supra quae," following the consecration, are there fused into one, are facts which are familiar to all who have studied the subject. And the text would deserve to be closely examined here if we could be quite sure that the writer, in composing a catechetical tract, intended to reproduce his text with verbal

¹ *P.L.* lxxviii. 996.

² Of the date and probable authorship of this tract something has been said, above, in vol. i. p. 52.

exactness. But of this we cannot by any means be sure; and therefore I will content myself with emphasizing this point, that the "Quam oblationem," though it does not necessarily presuppose the "Hanc igitur," does presuppose the "Te igitur" or some equivalent form. From whence we may conclude that, in the all but contemporary days of Innocent I., the very chief among the prayers which the transpositionists would (on the strength of Innocent's letter) place after the consecration already had its present position. Nor can any stress be, I think, rightly laid on the circumstance that the writer says: "Sacerdos dicit: Fac nobis *hanc* oblationem ascriptam," &c.,¹ in other words, that he says "this" instead of "which." He could hardly quote, apart from its context, a passage beginning with a relative pronoun ("quam") without turning it into a demonstrative ("hanc").

Of earlier testimonies to the Canon there are none beyond the brief statements of the "Liber Pontificalis" about the "Sanctus" and the "Qui pridie," which have been already mentioned.

¹ *P.L.* xvi. 443.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE PATER NOSTER, THE FRACTION, AND THE COMMUNION.

NO one, perhaps, who has assisted with attention at High Mass, can have failed to be struck with the analogy between the chant of the preface, which leads up to the "Sanctus," and that of the "præfatiuncula" or "little preface" ("Praeceptis salutaribus moniti," &c.), by which the Pater Noster is introduced. And the similarity must have been much more striking when the Pater Noster, as well as the Sanctus, was chanted or recited aloud by the whole congregation. The old Gallican liturgy carries the analogy a step further. For just as the Gallican post Sanctus, as has been seen, takes up and developes the leading words and ideas of the Sanctus and Benedictus, so the "Liberanos," or Embolism as it is called, takes up and developes the last petition of the Lord's Prayer. In the Roman rite the greater preface alone is variable, and this within strict limits, while the little preface and the embolism are fixed formulæ, and the post Sanctus has disappeared in favour of the "Te igitur." The Gallican rite on the other hand exhibits the following complete parallelism:

Preface (variable).

SANCTUS.

Post Sanctus (variable).

Praefatiuncula (variable).

PATER NOSTER.

Embolism (variable).

It may be of interest to give a single example of a Gallican *praefatiuncula* and *embolism* respectively. They are from different Masses. The first of these prayers is indeed of such singular excellence as a piece of ecclesiastical Latin, in regard of the balance of phrases and the terseness of expression, that it seems worth while to give, in parentheses, the Latin corresponding to the very inadequate English translation.

Praefatiuncula. "Acknowledge, O Lord, the words which Thou hast prescribed, pardon the presumption which Thou hast commanded ('Agnosce, Domini, verba quae praecepisti, ignosce praesumptioni quam imperasti'). For it were ignorance not to know the grounds of our trust ('Ignorantia est enim non posse meritum,' *i.e.*, not to recognize that the merits in virtue of which we make our petition are not ours, but those of Christ our Lord), and it were contumacious not to obey the precept ('contumacia non servare praeceptum') whereby we are bidden to say: Our Father," &c.¹

Embolism. "Deliver us from evil, O God, Author of all good; deliver us from every temptation, from every scandal, from every heresy, from all the works of darkness; establish us in every

¹ *P.L.* lxxii. 317; Neale and Forbes, *Gallican Liturgies*, p. 150.

good work, and grant peace in our days, O God, Author of peace and of truth.”¹

Of the remarkable and significant affinity of the Gallican *praefatiunculae* and embolisms, notwithstanding their variability, with the corresponding invariable formulæ in the Roman, something will have to be said in Chapter xvi. Meanwhile it is to be observed that, whereas the Eastern liturgies place the solemn Fraction of the Host after the Pater Noster, in the Gallican and Mozarabic rites this ceremony precedes the Lord's prayer, and we have the clear though somewhat indirect testimony of St. Gregory the Great that such, down to his own time, was the custom in the Roman Church also. Indeed it can hardly be doubted that the change introduced by St. Gregory was suggested by the eastern usage. It has been objected against Gregory, by John of Syracuse, that he had introduced Byzantine customs into the Roman liturgy, and in particular “that you have ordered the Lord's prayer to be recited immediately after the Canon” (*i.e.*, before and not after the fraction). In reply the Pope gives as his reason that “it seems very incongruous (*valde inconveniens*) that we should recite over the sacrifice (*super oblationem*) a prayer which was compiled by a liturgiologist (*precem quam scholasticus composuerat*) and that we should not say, over the Body and Blood of our Redeemer, the prayer which He Himself delivered to us.”²

¹ *P.L. ibid.* 314; Neale and Forbes, p. 146. Cf. Lucas in *Dublin Review*, Jan. 1894, p. 114.

² *Epist. ix.* 12 (*P.L. lxxviii.* 955 ff.).

So far all is plain. But it unfortunately happens that the words which in St. Gregory's letter immediately precede those which have just been quoted, have been strangely misconstrued even down to our own days; and as the question as to their meaning is of some importance for the right understanding of the history of the liturgy, it may be worth while to examine them somewhat closely. The sentence runs as follows:—

“Orationem vero dominicam mox post precem dicimus quia mos apostolorum fuit ut ad ipsam solummodo orationem oblationis hostiam consecrarent.”

Now the meaning of the first clause in this sentence (“We recite the Lord's prayer immediately after the prex”) is plain enough; but the rendering of the second clause (“quia mos apostolorum fuit,” &c., *i.e.*, “because it was the custom of the Apostles,” &c.) has been keenly disputed. What was it that the Apostles were accustomed to do? What was the “mos apostolorum” here indicated? The answer to this question depends on the further question whether we are to construe together the words “oblationis hostiam” (“the sacrificial host,”—literally “the host of offering”), or “orationem oblationis” (“the sacrificial prayer”—literally “the prayer of offering”). As a matter of mere latinity, apart from all regard to liturgical phraseology, the first rendering might seem preferable, as indeed it has seemed preferable to almost innumerable writers on the subject. But then, if this were the right

construction, we should have to believe that St. Gregory believed what is, I think, quite incredible, viz., that the Apostles "were accustomed to consecrate the sacrificial host with no other accompaniment than the prayer," *i.e.*, the Our Father! Now, following Probst, I am convinced that St. Gregory's meaning is very far removed from this. Indeed, one might almost say that it is the very reverse of this. Join the words "orationem oblationis" and see what the sense is then. "The Apostles," we now read, "were accustomed to consecrate the host with no other accompaniment than the sacrificial prayer." Now "the sacrificial prayer" is, of course, the "prex," that is to say, the Canon, *plus* the preface. In other words, the Lord's Prayer had no place in the central portion ("the sacrificial prayer") of the primitive liturgy. This is straightforward and intelligible, and is, moreover, entirely credible. And it is not only credible, but, I believe, almost demonstrably true. The Lord's Prayer has, in fact, no place in the anaphora of the liturgy, either of the Apostolic Constitutions, or of the Ethiopic Church Ordinances, or of Serapion.¹ Moreover, whereas the phrase "oblationis hostia" is, so far as syntax goes, good Latin, it is, so far as meaning is concerned, distinctly tautological; for what kind of a "host" could there be which was not "sacrificial" or not "offered"? On the other hand "oratio oblationis" ("the sacrificial prayer" or "prayer of offering") is a technical term which precisely

¹ Funk, *Didascalia*, i. 515; ii. 101, 177.

and literally represents the Greek εὐχὴ προσφορᾶς. "Oratio oblationis" is, in fact, Funk's rendering of εὐχὴ προσφόρου (*sic*) where it occurs as a quite distinctive superscription to the preface of Serapion's liturgy.¹ This document was not published till many years after Probst had first urged that we should construe "orationem oblationis" and not "oblationis hostiam"; and it affords a somewhat remarkable confirmation of a theory which now deserves, as it seems to me, to be regarded as satisfactorily established.²

The only serious difficulty, or apparently serious difficulty, which militates against the acceptance of this conclusion lies in the little word "quia." It seems odd, at first sight, that St. Gregory should say that he has done something "because" the Apostles did otherwise. But his "because" must be taken as affecting not merely the words which immediately follow, but the whole of the succeeding context. The sense is "I have done this because *whereas* the Apostles used only the 'prayer of oblation' it seemed to me incongruous," and the rest.

In its present position the Pater noster marks the transition from the strictly sacrificial to what has been called the sacramental portion of the Mass. For while, on the one hand, it is plain that St. Gregory the Great desired to bring this prayer into close relation with the body of the Canon, on the

¹ Funk, *Didascalia*, ii. 172.

² Probst, *Liturgie der drei ersten Jahrhunderten* (1870), pp. 355 f. Cf. J. R. Gasquet in *Dublin Review*, April 1890, p. 286; Lucas in *Dublin Review*, Jan. 1894, p. 112 note.

other hand the petition, " Give us this day our daily bread," was unquestionably referred, from the earliest times, to that heavenly food the sacramental reception whereof is essential to the fullest participation in the fruits of the Holy Sacrifice.

The sequence of ideas in the prayers and rites which immediately follow the Pater noster is worthy of attention. The " Libera nos " which (as has been seen) takes up and develops the concluding words of the Lord's Prayer, ends with a petition for peace; the fraction is immediately followed by the versicle " Pax Domini sit semper vobiscum " with its response; the " Agnus Dei " concludes with the petition " Dona nobis pacem," and it is followed by yet another prayer for peace (" O Lord Jesus Christ, who didst say to Thine Apostles: Peace I leave you," &c.), which in its turn serves to introduce the " Kiss of Peace " in its present modified form. It is plain enough that there has been development and expansion at this point in the liturgy, though the steps of the development are not easy to trace.¹ Some of them, however, will be incidentally indicated in what follows.

In the first place it must be noted that the fraction of the Host originally had a definite purpose which has become entirely obscured in the course of liturgical history. The primitive altar-breads were very much larger than those which are now in use; and when the Host was broken, this was done, after the pattern set by our Lord Himself, in order that the assistant clergy might receive Com-

¹ Cf. Fortescue, p. 371.

munion in the form of particles therefrom. Another particle was reserved, to be consumed by the celebrant at a future Mass, in token of the essential one-ness of the Holy Sacrifice, whenever and wherever it might be offered. And the same truth was emphasized by another custom which, in Rome at least, prevailed during several centuries. This was the custom of sending, by the hands of duly ordained acolytes, to whom this precious privilege belonged, consecrated particles from the Host of the Pope's Mass, to such bishops as might be staying in the city and celebrating at the same time as the Pope himself. Indeed, the familiar phrase, "in communion with the Holy See," may not improbably have had its origin in this usage, or was at least closely connected therewith.¹ Before leaving the subject of the "fermentum," however, for such was the name by which these consecrated particles were designated, it will be worth while to quote, in a slightly abridged form, Dr. Fortescue's interesting passage on the subject:—

"From about the fourth century down to about the tenth we hear constantly that Popes and other bishops sent something called 'fermentum' to their priests. Anastasius Bibliothecarius, writing in the ninth century, says that Pope Melchiades (311—314) 'ordered that oblations for the consecra-

¹ The last three paragraphs are borrowed from the author's "Notes on the Mass" in *The Xaverian*, 1909. But Dr. Fortescue has dealt with this subject much more fully, as will be seen.

tion by the bishop should be sent to the churches, which is called the 'fermentum.'¹ . . . We have a contemporary reference in the letter of Innocent I. (401—417) to Decentius, already quoted. He says that the 'fermentum' is taken by acolytes on Sunday 'per titulos' (that is to the titular Roman churches), so that priests who on that day cannot concelebrate or communicate at the Pope's altar may know that they are not 'separated from our communion.' But he does not wish it to be taken 'per paroecias' (the country parishes?) nor to secondary churches (outside the city) 'because the sacraments are not to be carried a long way.'² . . . It is clear that the 'fermentum' was the Holy Eucharist. Innocent's words about 'carrying the sacraments' are plain; in *Ordo Rom. I.* we find the bishop (not Pope) using the 'particula fermenti quod ab Apostolico consecratum est' [*i.e.*, the particle consecrated by the Pope] just as the Pope uses the 'Sancta' [the particle consecrated at a previous Mass] mixing it with the consecrated wine at the Pax.³ The use and idea of the 'fermentum' then are obvious. It corresponds to the 'Sancta.' The Pope sent a fragment of the host consecrated by him to the suburban bishops [? or bishops present in Rome] and Roman parish priests. As the 'Sancta' was a symbol of the identity of the sacrifice from one Mass to another, so was the 'fer-

¹ *P.L.* cxxvii. 1499 f.; *Lib. Pont.* (Duchesne) i. 168 f. (Fortescue's notes are here abridged.)

² *P.L.* xx. 556 f.; *Bona I.* xxiii. 8.

³ *P.L.* lxxviii. 948.

mentum' a sign of union between the bishop and his clergy. As far back as Victor I. (190—202) we find the same custom. St. Irenæus reminds him that he sends the Eucharist to other bishops.¹ One cannot conceive a more pregnant symbol of unity and inter-communion. . . . It may be noted that the meaning of the word is primarily symbolic. 'Fermentum' is not quite the same as 'fermentatum.' The idea seems to have been [nay, most certainly was] that this particle of the Holy Eucharist [or rather, the Holy Eucharist itself] unites the Church as leaven unites the Church."²

In the above passage I have omitted sentences dealing with the real or supposed difficulty as to the use of leavened or unleavened bread. I doubt whether any argument, under this head, can be drawn from the use of the word "fermentum." The term is (as Dr. Fortescue says) "primarily symbolic." The Holy Eucharist was in very truth the principal means whereby the Church was not merely "united" but "leavened." It only remains to say that, when the practices above described fell into disuse they left us only a shrunken survival in "the commixture of a particle of the host just consecrated."³ This "intinction" or "embolism" has, however, a significance of its own, and though a survival is yet no mere survival. It is commonly and, as it would seem, correctly held to be sym-

¹ Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, v. 24.

² Fortescue, pp. 368 ff.

³ P. 369.

bolical of the re-union of the Body and Blood of our Lord when He resumed His human life—under new conditions—at the Resurrection. From all that has been said it plainly appears that the fraction was, in its origin, much more obviously than it is at present, an act immediately preparatory to Holy Communion.¹

The “Agnus Dei,” as we know it, was introduced into the liturgy, at this point, by Pope Sergius I. (c. 700).² It would seem to have been originally a choral chant only, the words not being recited by the celebrant, but sung while he prayed in secret. It is beyond doubt that, at first, each invocation concluded with the words “Miserere nobis,” a usage which still survives in the one single Church of St. John Lateran. “During the Middle Ages on Maundy Thursday the Agnus Dei was sung with ‘Miserere nobis’ thrice. Gühr accounts for this as a result of the omission of the kiss of peace on that day.³ It can be explained more naturally by the fact that the station is at St. John Lateran.”⁴ It is not an improbable conjecture that the substitution of the petition, “Dona nobis pacem,” in the third invocation, had for its purpose to bring

¹ Of the elaborate symbolical fractions which characterize the Eastern, Mozarabic, and Celtic rites space will not allow me to speak here.

² So the *Lib. Pont.* (Duchesne i. 376 *apud* Fortescue, p. 387). Its presence in MSS. of the Gregorianum is probably due to interpolation. I say, above, “at this point,” because, in a slightly different form, the “Agnus Dei” is already found in the “Gloria in Excelsis.”

³ Gühr, *Das h. Messopfer*, p. 671, n. 2.

⁴ Fortescue, pp. 387 f.

the "Agnus Dei," into closer harmony with the dominant idea of "peace," which, as has been seen, pervades this portion of the Mass. Yet, even now, there is, be it said with all reverence, a certain anomaly in the separation of the salutation "Pax Domini sit semper vobiscum," which immediately follows the fraction, from the actual giving of the kiss of peace.

With reference to the Pax itself, it is to be observed that its position in the Roman Mass is all but unique. In every one of the Eastern liturgies, as also in the early Gallican and Mozarabic rites, and almost certainly in the earlier Ambrosian, the kiss of peace is or was given, not before the Communion, but at the commencement of the sacrificial portion of the Mass, *i.e.*, immediately or all but immediately after the dismissal of the catechumens and penitents. And it is safe to infer that this must have been its original place in the Roman liturgy also.¹ The only possible objection to this conclusion may be found in some words of Tertullian's tract "on Prayer," which have been thought to indicate that, in the African rite of the second and third centuries, the Pax occurred (as in our own rite) after the Pater noster. "Africa," says Dr. Fortescue, herein agreeing with Dom F. Cabrol,

¹ St. Justin's testimony would be unexceptionable if we could be quite sure that he is describing the Roman practice, and not, as seems to me more probable, that of Ephesus (see above, chap. ix.). "Ἀλλήλους φιλήματι ἀσπασόμεθα πανσάμενοι τῶν εὐχῶν. Ἐπειτα προσφέρεται . . . ἄρτος καὶ ποτήριον κτλ. (Apol. i., 65).

"was certainly similar to Rome in its liturgy, and Africa had the Kiss of Peace very much where we have it now, in connection with the Lord's Prayer, just before the Communion."¹ But this statement appears to me little short of misleading. The contention that Tertullian's words about the kiss of peace have any reference to the Pater noster as recited in the Mass, is, to say the least, by no means convincing. For the writer has already passed, in a previous chapter, from the consideration of the Lord's prayer in particular to that of prayer—or public prayer—in general.² "Dom Cabrol notes," says Dr. Fortescue elsewhere, "that the 'Kiss of Peace' was the ceremony which ac-

¹ Fortescue, p. 370, referring to Tertullian "*de Orat.* 10, 14, 18 (*P.L.* i. 1281)", which should be, as given on p. 41, *de Orat.* 18 (*P.L.* i. 1176 f.), and to St. Augustine, "*Sermo* vi. (*P.L.* xxxviii. 561, 565)", where there is clearly an error, for neither in *Serm.* vi. (col. 59 ff.) nor on col. 561, 565 (*Serm.* xc.) is there anything bearing on the subject. Perhaps the reference should be to *Serm.* ccxxvii. (*P.L.* xxxviii. 1101), where the position of the Pax between the Pater Noster and the Communion is quite explicitly indicated. But "it would not, perhaps, be safe to rely on this testimony, for the sermon is by some ascribed to St. Caesarius of Arles, who lived more than a century later" than St. Augustine (Lucas in *Dublin Review*, l.c. p. 128; cf. Venables in *Dict. Chr. Antiq.*, p. 904), and in any case the witness of St. Augustine is not available for the second or third century. He was contemporary with Innocent I., in whose time the supposedly altered Roman practice may be supposed to have taken root in Africa, even if it did not originate thence.

² "Praemissa legitima et ordinaria oratione (*i.e.* the Pater Noster) quasi fundamento, *accidentium jus est desideriorum, jus est superfluendi extrinsecus petitiones, cum memoria tamen praeceptorum,*" &c. (c. x. *P.L.* i. 1165).

accompanied all public prayers (de Orat. xviii.).” But a passage which deals with “ a ceremony which accompanied all public prayers ” cannot legitimately be cited as an authority for the precise position which that ceremony held in the liturgy of the Mass.¹

Nor is the reason or motive which may probably have led to the transfer of the Pax to its present position far to seek, though I know of no writer who has explicitly called attention to it. It is, however, plainly suggested by Mr. Jenner when he says: “ The Roman rite, *which has completely obliterated all distinction between the ‘ Missa Catechumenorum’ and the ‘ Missa Fidelium,’* associates this sign of unity, not with the beginning of the latter but with the Communion, and this position is as old as the letter of St. Innocent I. (416) to Decentius of Gubbio.”² It is at least possible that the “ obliteration ” of which Mr. Jenner here speaks was intentional, at least after what might nowadays be called a “ subconscious ” fashion. At any rate, whether consciously intentional or not, it involved, probably in successive stages, a triple transfer, viz., (1) of the chief collect to its present position in the Roman Mass; (2) of the “ Nomina,” with their accompanying prayers, to the Canon; and (3) of the Pax. When the dismissal of the catechumens had ceased to form part of the daily or weekly

¹ But cf. Cabrol, *Dict. d'Arch. Chr.* i. 604.

² *Catholic Encyclopædia*, vi. 362 (11). Italics mine. For “ as old as,” in the above passage, it would have been better to write “ older than ” the letter of St. Innocent.

ceremonial, the point in the liturgy at which it had previously taken place ceased to have that special significance, or to deserve that prominence, which it had once possessed; and just as the beginning of the whole service now seemed the most suitable position of the chief collect, so also no more appropriate position could have been found for the Pax than that which it now holds just before the Communion. It is, however, on its appropriateness as setting the seal of ratification on all that has been done, that St. Innocent lays stress in the letter to Decentius, and he seems to imply that the present position of the Pax was not the result of some recent innovation, but was already of long standing.¹

The "Domine, non sum dignus," affords, like the "Agnus Dei," an excellent example of the apt application of a text from the Gospel to a sublime mystery with which, in its original context, it had no relation; except indeed that relation of all-pervading analogy which binds together into one living whole, the incidents of our Lord's life on earth, and the sacramental system by means of which His ceaseless beneficence is continued through the ages.

Dr. Fortescue has an interesting passage, here reproduced in substance, in which he suggests that "the little group of prayers at the Communion of the people" were (probably) borrowed from the ceremony of private administration of the Holy

¹ His words are: "Cum post omnia quae aperire non debeo pax sit necessario indicenda, per quam constet populum ad omnia quae in mysteriis aguntur . . . praeuisse consensum, ac finita esse pacis concludentis signaculo demonstrantur" (*P.L.* xx. 553).

Sacrament. This ceremony is itself a sort of brief compendium of certain portions of the Mass. It begins with the "Asperges," in a form reminiscent of the introit; the Confiteor follows and is itself followed by a collect; after which "Ecce Agnus Dei" echoes, says Dr. Fortescue, the "Agnus Dei" of the Mass, from which also the "Domine non sum dignus" is obviously borrowed. And these items, originally taken over from the Mass, are here re-introduced into the liturgy.¹

The somewhat fragmentary invocation which in a modern missal is called "Communio"—affords an opportunity for saying a few words about the choral portions of the Mass. These choral pieces may be roughly divided into three classes, viz., responses, hymns and antiphons. The responses call for no special remark. The word "hymn" in the above classification must be taken in a wide sense, as including not only the "sequences" which on certain occasions follow the gradual (*i.e.*, the "Victimae Paschali" at Easter, the "Veni Sancte Spiritus" at Whitsuntide, the "Lauda Sion" on Corpus Christi, the "Stabat Mater" and the "Dies Irae"), but also the Kyrie Eleison, the Gloria in Excelsis, the Credo, the Sanctus and Benedictus, and the Agnus Dei. Of these, some, like the Gloria in Excelsis, the sequence and the Credo interrupt the course of the service as performed by the celebrant at the altar, the sacred ministers sitting down till the conclusion of the

¹ Fortescue, pp. 384 f., citing Krazer, *De . . . antiquis Eccl. occid. liturgiis* (1786).

chant. Others, like the Sanctus and the Benedictus, are sung while the celebrant continues to recite those prayers which (for this very reason) are to be said "secreto—in a whisper," or, like the Domine non sum dignus, "moderata voce," *i.e.*, loud enough to be heard by the attendants, but not so as to interrupt the singing. But in two respects the antiphons, and in particular the introit, the offertory, and the communion differ from the hymns. In the first place they are taken, normally at least, from the psalms. Indeed, each of them may be regarded as the shrunken survival of a complete psalm with its doxology and antiphon. And secondly they were originally intended to fill up certain intervals during which something was being done which otherwise would have been done in silence. Thus the introit, as has been seen, was sung while the celebrant entered the church and proceeded to the altar; the offertory while the oblata were presented and received; the "Communio," as its name denotes, while the faithful received the Holy Sacrament. Bona affirms that at least on some occasions the antiphon of the offertory psalm was repeated as a refrain after each verse or two, like the invitatory at Matins; but the point is one which I must be content to leave to those who have made a study of the history of the ecclesiastical chant.¹ The survival of the antiphon alone, in the case of the offertory, seems to

¹ "Apud Gregorium singula offertoria plures versus habent, adjunctos, et quandoque integer psalmus repetita post singulos versus antiphona cantari solebat" (*Bona*, II. viii. 3).

point to a time when the only prayer recited at the oblation of the unconsecrated host and chalice was the *secreta*, with its invitatory introduction, "Orate fratres," and the response thereto. The fact that the invitation and response are to be said "moderata voce," and the prayer itself recited, as its name denotes, "secreto," may be taken as a clear indication that the choir were, so to say, "in possession." Nor is it to be supposed that, down to comparatively modern times, mottets *ad libitum* were sung during this portion of the Mass.

The gradual and the Alleluia antiphon (or the tract which replaces the latter in ferial Masses) stand on a somewhat different footing. They were, originally, not merely chants intended to fill up an interval during which something was being done, but instances of the very ancient liturgical principle according to which scripture lessons were made to alternate with psalmody, as in the Matins of the Breviary. The origin and significance of the name "Gradual" has been explained in Chapter VI.

It has already been observed, but the statement will bear repetition here, that the postcommunion prayer, at least in the older Masses, for the most part explicitly assumes that all the faithful who are present have received Holy Communion. This prayer is in fact the public and official "thanksgiving" of the entire congregation, immediately after which the faithful were dismissed with the words "Ite, missa est"; words from which, as has been said, the Mass (*missa*, *i.e.*, *missio*, dismissal) takes its name.

CHAPTER XV.

THE SAINTS AND THE MASS.¹

THAT the Mass, being a sacrifice, and indeed the supreme sacrifice, cannot be offered to our Lady or to any saint, every Catholic child who has been even moderately well instructed is perfectly aware. But it is very possible that some of our readers may never have noticed that the Mass contains not so much as a single prayer addressed to the Blessed Virgin or to any of the saints. All the prayers of the Mass, without exception, are addressed to God Himself, as befits petitions which pertain to a distinctively sacrificial ritual. The only apparent exception to the foregoing statement is to be found in certain invocations which very occasionally occur, or may occur, in the choral portion of the Mass, as, for instance, in the "Stabat Mater," which forms the "sequence" of the Mass on the Feast of the Seven Dolours of Our Lady.

Nevertheless, our Lady and the saints, though not directly invoked in the prayers of the Eucharistic liturgy, hold a highly-honoured place in relation to the Mass; and this to an extent which may possibly surprise those who have not closely attended to the matter.

¹ This chapter, with the exception of the concluding paragraphs, is reprinted from *The Xaverian*, 1909.

In the first place it is most strictly enjoined by the laws of the Church that beneath every altar on which the Holy Sacrifice is offered, or in a cavity of the table of the altar itself, some relics of martyrs should be enshrined. This usage goes back, of course, to the days when Mass was offered, in the catacombs, on the very tombs of those who had sealed their confession of the Christian faith by a martyr's death. But it has, moreover, a scriptural basis and justification in the words of the Apocalypse: "I saw under the altar the souls of them that were slain for the Word of God and for the testimony which they held."¹ And it is full of a most profound and beautiful and encouraging significance. For it reminds us that all the sufferings of the martyrs, and indeed all the sufferings for justice's sake even of those faithful servants of God who are not in the strict sense martyrs, are fused, as it were, and made one with the sufferings of Christ our Lord, being accepted by God as an efficacious sacrifice; efficacious precisely by virtue of their union with His self-offering.

Secondly, every Mass assigned to a saint's day has a collect, secreta and postcommunion in which God's mercy is asked "through the intercession" of the servant of God whose feast is being kept.

But thirdly, in addition to this, those fixed and unchanging prayers which are common to all Masses contain repeated references to the saints, as follows:

¹ Apoc. vi. 9.

(a) In the "Confiteor" we call, as witnesses of our acknowledgment of sin, and as intercessors for pardon, the Blessed Virgin Mary, St. Michael as representing the heavenly hosts, St. John the Baptist, as representative of the saints of the Old Testament, SS. Peter and Paul as representing those of the New, and finally "all the saints" without exception. It is, assuredly, a distinguished audience to which we make our appeal; and it would be the height of bad manners if, in the very act of inviting such an audience to listen to us, we were ourselves to pay little attention to what we are saying, or again (as sometimes happens) to mumble the words of our invitation.

(b) On ascending to the predella after the Confiteor, the celebrant kisses the altar begging the intercession of the martyrs whose relics are enclosed therein "*quorum reliquiae hic sunt*"—and "of all the saints."

(c) After the Lavabo, in the prayer, "Suscipe Sancta Trinitas," the elements, as yet unconsecrated, are offered in memory of the passion, resurrection and ascension of our Lord, and in honour of our Lady, St. John the Baptist, SS. Peter and Paul, those whose relics are contained in or beneath the altar, and "of all the saints"; and their intercession is asked.

(d) In the Canon, at the "Communicantes," commemoration is made of our Lady, of the Apostles (including St. Paul, but not St. Mathias), and of twelve martyrs, five of them Popes, and all of them except St. Cyprian connected with Rome.

The number, twelve, must be taken of course as indicating that those who are enumerated are named as representing the rest; though here, as elsewhere, explicit mention is likewise made of "all the saints." In many early liturgical manuscripts, as, *e.g.*, in the Stowe Missal, the list is expanded so as to include the names of local saints; and it may be mentioned here that the earliest form of "canonization" consisted in the placing of a name in this position of honour. No one, however, will nowadays question the wisdom of restricting the enumeration of names to a manageable number; and no selection could be more aptly representative than that of those whom the local Roman Church delighted to honour. For it must not be forgotten that the Missal, as has been said in a previous chapter, is a distinctively Roman book—originally the Pope's own Mass-book—the use of which was at first gradually adopted, and at last authoritatively prescribed, throughout Western Christendom.

(*e*) In the "Nobis quoque peccatoribus" we ask that we may be found not unworthy to have a part "with the holy Apostles and martyrs," after which words another characteristic and representative enumeration occurs. The Apostles, indeed, are not individually named, but after "St. John," *i.e.*, the Baptist, the last of the Old Testament saints and himself a glorious martyr, there occur the names, deliberately selected, of seven men and seven women, all of them martyrs for the faith, with, as usual, a concluding mention of "all the saints."

So far I had written in 1909. To Dr. Fortes-

cue's learned pages I am indebted for some further remarks on the list of saints contained in the "*No-bis quoque*," which are worth quoting here, as emphasizing, among other points, the carefully calculated and strictly supplementary character of this list.

"In all rites the celebrant prays for the living and the dead and remembers the Saints. But the order in which these three elements of the Intercession follow one another varies. . . . The names of the Saints here are arranged in a scheme, as at the '*Communicantes*.' First comes St. John (as our Lady in the other list), then seven men and seven women. There is evidently an intention of not repeating the names already mentioned, but of supplementing the former list, to which '*cum tuis sanctis apostolis et martyribus*' seems to contain a general allusion.¹ Who is the John here named? . . . It must be the Baptist. St. John the Evangelist had already been named in the '*Communicantes*,' other lists repeat no names, not even our Lady's. . . . St. Stephen follows as the first martyr, again an unaccountable (?) omission in the former list, and St. Matthias and St. Barnabas, left out from the Apostles before. Ignatius of Antioch, Pope Alexander I. (109—119), Marcellinus, a priest, and Peter, an exorcist martyred at Silva Candida under Diocletian, make up the list of men. The women are all well known. All Saints here are Martyrs, all are either Roman or saints popular at Rome."²

¹ A slight verbal transposition has been ventured on, here.

² Fortescue, pp. 356 f.

In the above passage Dr. Fortescue has deserved well of all students of the Roman liturgy. But I do not know why, in a sentence which has not been quoted, the omission of St. John the Baptist from the first list should be called "an obvious fault," or that of St. Stephen "unaccountable." The saints enumerated in "Communicantes" are "apostles and martyrs," the martyrs enumerated are Roman or (as St. Cyprian) closely connected with Rome. St. John the Baptist was not an apostle and St. Stephen was not a Roman martyr. They accordingly find their place, and a very distinguished place, in the second enumeration.

(f) Finally, in the "Libera nos," we beg that our Lady, SS. Peter and Paul and St. Andrew "and all the Saints" may by their intercession, obtain for us the boon of peace. Here again the enumeration is manifestly "representative." It is indeed not easy to feel sure as to the reason for the mention of St. Andrew here. Possibly no other is needed than that he was St. Peter's brother, and that as such he is named with him.

It would, in the present writer's opinion, be altogether futile to seek any recondite explanation of the number and the present distribution of these six references to the intercession of our brethren in heaven. It may be sufficient to recognize that a wise Providence controls, to beneficent ends, even what might seem to us to be purely accidental. And we may well be thankful that, as things are, the memory of the saints, and our need of their intercession, is so repeatedly brought to mind in the

liturgy of the Mass. "Our conversation is in Heaven," says St. Paul, who elsewhere reminds us of the "crowd of witnesses" who, from the heights of Heaven, witness all our struggles here below; and daily at the commencement of the most solemn portion of the Mass, the Church bids us to "lift up our hearts" to heavenly things. This is precisely what the frequent mention of the saints, our brethren, our exemplars, our witnesses, our intercessors, will help us to do, if only we take the trouble to attend to the words which we use, or which the celebrant utters on our behalf, during Holy Mass.

CHAPTER XVI.

THE ROMAN AND THE EARLY GALLICAN RITES.

THE statement has been made more than once in the course of this work that the liturgies of the Western Church had a common origin, and that this origin was distinctively Roman. It was "Eastern" only in the sense in which Christianity itself came from the East, and certainly not in the sense that, apart from incidental and sporadic borrowings, any one of the Western liturgies can be traced, or with any possibility referred, to any but a Roman source. This is a statement which ought, I venture to think, to have been long since regarded as beyond dispute. But because the origin of the Gallican rite, with which the Ambrosian and the Mozarabic are confessedly closely allied, has quite recently been once more declared to be a problem that awaits solution, it may be worth while to restate, here, the reasons which, more than twenty years ago, led the present writer to the conclusion that the "problem" even then admitted of a simple and satisfactory solution.

To state the solution first, leaving the reasons which support it to be subsequently set forth, it is to this effect. The structural differences which distinguish the early Gallican rite from the Roman liturgy as we know it are to be accounted for by the

not unreasonable hypothesis that, in the course of three or four centuries, both rites had undergone considerable modifications and developments since the days when the remoter churches, at their foundation, brought their liturgy with them from Rome. The course of development in Rome itself proceeded by way of successive and gradual changes made by authority. The changes thus made in Rome were by no means all adopted in Lombardy, Gaul and Spain; others, adopted in principle, were in these countries carried to extremes,—a point on which something further will be said in the concluding paragraphs of this chapter.

The only point in which the conclusion here formulated differs from that which was put forward in certain publications to be presently quoted, is this. In former years I had too easily assumed that, at some time in the course of the fourth century, probably in the time of St. Damasus, the Roman liturgy had undergone "a drastic reform," in which the Gallican and Spanish churches had not shared. But for such a drastic reform there is no evidence; and by the one far-reaching change, viz., the substitution of variable for unvarying prayers and formulæ, which, either in the fourth century, or possibly even in the third, undoubtedly was made in the Roman rite, the Gallican and Spanish Churches, and those of Lombardy too, were not only affected but, for lack of salutary restraint, affected quite unduly.

Apart from sundry differences of opinion on minor points, the main proposition as to the Roman origin

of the early Gallican liturgy, and as to the general causes of the differences which distinguish it from the Roman rite in the earliest form in which the latter comes before us as an organized whole, was first put forward by Probst (in his *Liturgie der drei ersten Jahrhunderten*) in 1870, as also in his later works; then, with the support of fresh evidence to be hereafter given, by the present writer in a couple of articles contributed to *The Dublin Review*, in 1893—4; and two years later by Dom P. Cagin, in a very learned dissertation published in the fifth volume of the *Paléographie Musicale* (1896).¹ Father Cagin's view is supported, in the main, by Dom F. Cabrol in *Les Origines Liturgiques* (1906), and is, I believe, maintained by more than one of the contributors to the *Dictionnaire de l'Archeologie Chrétienne*, now in course of publication, but not, at present, accessible to me.²

The ground having been thus cleared by a state-

¹ "In a long Introduction to the Ambrosian Antiphony, which he has published in *facsimile* from a MS. in the British Museum, [Father Cagin] takes occasion to enquire into the relation of the early Gallican to the early Roman liturgy. It is plain that he has not seen the *Dublin* articles, and it is all the more gratifying to find that he not only agrees with the main conclusions arrived at by the writer [of them], but bases [these conclusions] for the most part on the same considerations, some of which are put forth in his dissertation as entirely new" (Lucas, in *The Month*, Jan. 1902, p. 6). In the article here quoted, Father Cagin's dissertation was erroneously ascribed to Dom A. Mocquereau, the general editor of the *Paléographie Musicale*.

² Of this most valuable work I have, for reasons previously stated, been able to utilize only the article on the liturgy of Africa.

ment of the proposition which has to be made good, it remains to specify the grounds on which the conclusion rests. This cannot, perhaps, be better done than by reproducing, here, with some additional details, the substance, and for the most part, the very words of an article which appeared in *The Month* just twelve years ago (January, 1902), and which summarized, in the light of Father Cagin's researches published in the meanwhile, the aforesaid contributions to *The Dublin Review*. The argument, it will be observed, is cumulative, and rests on the number of particulars in which the Western rites, notwithstanding differences of detail, show a remarkable agreement among themselves, and a hardly less remarkable divergence from all the Eastern liturgies. Here, then, are the particulars:

1. Throughout the East the liturgical prayers—as distinct from the Scripture lessons and the choral portions of the Mass—are invariable, in this sense, that they do not change from day to day in accordance with the festival or the season. There are, indeed, many different sets of such prayers in use in the East, a number of different “Masses” (*i.e.*, series of Mass-prayers), which bear the names of St. James, St. Mark, St. Chrysostom, St. Basil, and so forth; but the point is that each of these Masses was intended as a fixed form of daily or weekly service; and any later usage by which different Masses have been assigned to different days must be regarded as entirely distinct in character from the system, common to all the Churches of the West, by which portions of the Mass-prayers were made to

vary from day to day in accordance with the ecclesiastical calendar. This contrast has of course been repeatedly noticed by writers on the subject, and may be said to be matter of common knowledge. But the importance of the line of demarcation thus established between all the Western liturgies on the one side and all the Eastern on the other, has been insisted on at considerable length and in detail by Father Cagin.¹

(2) Another particular in which the Western liturgies agree, or can be shown to have originally agreed, as against the Eastern, is, as has been pointed out in a former chapter, that in the formula by which the words of institution are immediately introduced, the Western liturgies without exception have—or formerly had—the words, “*Qui pridie* (or, *Ipse enim pridie*) *quam pateretur*,” whereas the Eastern liturgies, likewise without exception, have, “*in qua nocte tradebatur*,” or an equivalent phrase.² This, it will be seen on consideration, is a point of quite primary importance. The agreement, on the one hand and on the other, cannot be accidental; the liturgies which have either the one form or the other must have derived it from some common source, and whereas the Easterns might have derived theirs independently from the text of the New Testament, this is not the case with the form which embodies the words “*pridie*” and “*pateretur*”; for neither word occurs in any of the

¹ Cagin, pp. 45 ff.

² *Dublin Review*, Oct. 1893, p. 115; Cagin, pp. 55 ff.

Scriptural narratives of the institution of the Eucharist. Whether, as the "Liber Pontificalis" seems to imply, the Western formula was introduced in Rome by Pope Alexander I. (A.D. 108—118), may be regarded as not quite certain, but at any rate it is impossible to suggest any other local origin from which it can be supposed to have spread over the whole of Western Christendom.¹

Only less important than the "Qui pridie" as a witness to the common origin of the Western liturgies, is the little preface to the Pater noster, and the subsumption or clausula of the same prayer. Every one of the Western liturgies, and not one of the Eastern, has two formulæ corresponding, respectively, both in structure and in phraseology, to the "Praeceptis salutaribus" and to the "Liberamur" of the Roman rite. The two cases deserve to be studied separately. Take first the "praefatiuncula."

(3) There is, indeed, in all the Eastern liturgies, except the three primitive ones which omit the Lord's Prayer altogether, a prologue which serves

¹ See above, chapter xi. Duchesne is surely mistaken when he writes: "L'auteur attribue ici à Alexandre l'insertion dans la liturgie du *Qui pridie*, c'est à dire des paroles *commemoratives de l'institution* de l'eucharistie." There is question here, not of words "commemorative of the institution of the Eucharist," but of inserting in the words commemorative of the institution a phrase commemorative of the passion—that is to say, of substituting "*Qui pridie quam pateretur*" for "*In qua nocte tradebatur.*" Altaserra's observation, quoted by Duchesne, *ad loc.*, is beside the mark: "Constitutum de memoria passionis Christi in missa celebranda non est proprium Alexandri, sed potius ipsius Christi."

to lead up to it, and which is to this extent analogous to the little preface of the Western rites. But in the West the introductory formula is distinguished by two characteristic features, viz., (*a*) that it is relatively short, and (*b*) that it normally and almost invariably contains some reference to the divine precept ("Praeceptis salutaribus moniti," &c.). In the Eastern liturgies, on the other hand, the student will, I believe, look in vain for an introductory formula which embodies just this thought.¹ In this connection it may be added that Father Cagin notes a special form of the prologue to the Pater noster ("Divino magisterio edocti," &c.), formerly prescribed for the Mass of Holy Saturday in the Ambrosian rite, and still allowed on that day as an alternative. This survival from ancient times suggests, on the one hand, that the prologue was once variable in the Ambrosian as well as in the Gallican rite, and on the other hand confirms what has been said as to the close affinity of all Western "praefatiunculae."² The single instance which affords a modified or partial exception to the above statement so far as it relates to the Eastern rites is to be found in the liturgy of the Coptic Jacobites, printed by Mr. Brightman from a thirteenth century MS., a witness hardly available for an even relatively early usage, and in agreement neither with the Greek "Liturgy of St. Mark" nor with that of the Abyssinian Jacobites. The text

¹ Cf. Brightman, p. 59 (Syrian); 134 f. (Egyptian); 339 (Byzantine); &c.

² Cagin, p. 130.

is, in fact, quite late enough to have been affected by Roman influences. Yet even in this isolated example the prayer which introduces the Pater noster fills nearly the whole of one of Mr. Brightman's pages; and it is only in the conclusion of the prayer that we read the words which recall the Western formulæ, viz., "Bestow upon us Thy Holy Spirit that with a pure heart . . . we make bold in fearless confidence to say the holy prayer which Thy beloved Son gave . . . saying . . . pray ye thus, and say: Our Father, &c."¹

(4) Turning now to the embolism ("Libera nos Domine," &c.), we find, indeed, in the liturgy of St. Mark the words: "We beseech Thee, God the Father Almighty, that Thou wouldst not lead us into temptation, but deliver us from evil," and a similar form is found in the Coptic and in the Syrian liturgy of St. James.² This is the nearest approach to the Western "Libera," from which, however, it differs by subsuming, first of all, the petition, "lead us not into temptation." In the Byzantine liturgy the embolism is a prayer to the effect that God would look down in mercy on the bowed heads of the congregation.³ By contrast with all this, the Western embolism in the great majority of cases begins with the words "Libera nos" ("Deliver us"); and in all but one of the few instances in which this is not so, the general purport of the embolism is the same as that of the Roman

¹ Brightman, pp. 181 f.

² Pp. 136, 182, 60.

³ Pp. 340, 392, 411.

form. Thus, the Bobbio Missal has only one such prayer, and this—identical with the Roman—is in the “*Missa cottidiana Romensis*”; an indication that in the Church for which the Missal was prepared this part of the service was invariable. The Reichenau book has two, each commencing with the word “*Libera.*” The “*Missale Gallicanum*” has three, two commencing with “*Libera,*” the third with “*Exerce Liberator, in nobis juris proprii facultatem,*”—an appeal to God as our Deliverer. The “*Missale Gothicum*” has 17, all except three beginning with “*Libera.*” One (in the 17th Mass) has “*Ab omni malo nos eripe*” (“Rescue us from all evil”), another (27) has “*Exerce Liberator,*” &c., as in the case cited above, while yet another has in this place a collect “*Adesto Domine fidelibus tuis,*” &c. (“Come, O Lord, to the aid of Thy faithful,” &c.), which is obviously out of place, and is in fact identical with one of the collects in the *Leonianum*.¹ The Mozarabic embolism, according to present usage, is invariable, and begins: “*Liberati a malo, confirmati in bono,*” &c. (“Delivered from evil and strengthened in good,” &c.), a form which is plainly in close relationship with the Roman. Moreover, in each of five Celtic liturgical fragments given by Warren, the embolism begins, like the Roman, with the words “*Libera nos.*”²

¹ *The Month*, l.c. p. 9. It ought to have been there mentioned that these particulars, collected independently by the present writer, are likewise given by Cagin, p. 132, where a complete and detailed list of Gallican embolisms is set forth.

² Cagin, pp. 132 f. (note).

(5) A further point which calls for consideration is this. Although, as a simple matter of counting, the Gallican liturgy can show eleven variables as against five or six which are found in the Roman, yet when the facts of the case are analyzed, the results are found to be very different 'from those which might have been anticipated from a crude statement of the merely numerical contrast, a contrast, moreover, which tells rather against than in favour of the hypothesis that the Gallican liturgy is to be referred to a distinctively Eastern origin. In the first place, two at least of the eleven Gallican variables answer precisely, as has been shown, to corresponding fixed formulæ in the Roman Mass; and the circumstance that these formulæ are fixed in the Roman rite is probably due to the same tendency which led St. Gregory to restrict the number of variable prefaces, and of variable clauses in the Canon of the Mass, which previously to his time had been very considerably greater. But more than this. Of the remaining nine variables, six will be found to fall into couples, and this in such a way that each consists, or originally consisted, of an invitational formula followed by a collect. Moreover, each of the couples thus constituted corresponds to a single Roman or Ambrosian prayer, with its invitational reduced to the lowest terms in the single word "Oremus." This point must be dealt with somewhat more in detail. The actual facts of the case may perhaps be best indicated by means of a comparative table, substantially identical with one which was originally given in the *Dublin Review*. The first column shows, in

their order, those variable portions of the Gallican liturgy which were in ordinary use. The second and third columns show the corresponding portions of the Mozarabic and the Roman liturgy respectively. For the sake of clearness, the titles of all variables are given in capitals, those of fixed formulæ in ordinary type.

<i>Gallican</i>	<i>Mozarabic</i>	<i>Roman</i>
{ 1. PRAEFATIO MISSAE. ¹	MISSA. ⁶	"Oremus."
{ 2. COLLECTIO SEQUENS. ² (Recitatio nominum.)	ALIA ORATIO. (Recitatio nominum.)	[COLLECT. ⁸]
{ 3. COLLECTIO POST NOMINA.	ORAT. POST NOMINA.	"Orate Fratres."
{ 4. COLLECTIO AD PACEM. ³	ORATIO AD PACEM.	SECRETA.
{ 5. IMMOLATIO MISSAE. ⁴ ("Sanctus.")	ILLATIO. ("Sanctus.")	PREFACE. "("Sanctus.")
{ 6. POST SANCTUS. ("Qui pridie," &c.)	POST SANCTUS. ["Qui pridie," &c.] ⁷	"Te igitur," &c. ⁹ ("Qui pridie," &c.)
{ 7. POST MYSTERIA. ⁵	POST PRIDIE.	"Unde et memores," &c.
{ 8. ANTE ORAT. DOMINICAM. (Oratio Dominica.)	AD ORAT. DOM. (Oratio Dominica.)	"Praeceptis salutaribus," &c. (Oratio Dominica.)
{ 9. POST ORAT. DOMINICAM.	Post Orat. Dom. (invariable) ¹¹ .	"Libera nos," &c.
{ 10. POST EUCHARISTIAM.	(Wanting.)	"Oremus."
{ 11. CONSUMMATIO MISSAE. ¹⁰	Oratio (invariable). ¹²	POSTCOMMUNION.

¹ The Gallican "praefatio" is of course by no means to be confounded with the "preface" of the Roman Mass, to which it in no way corresponds. This prayer, or rather invitory, is often without a title in the Gallican books. Sometimes it is entitled "Collectio." (See the texts in *P.L.* lxxii. and in Neale and Forbes, *passim*.) In fifty-four instances, in the four Gallican Mass-books taken together, it has retained its true character as an invitory.

² The usual rubric is "Collectio sequitur." Sometimes this prayer is called "Collectio ante Nomina."

³ In the *Sacr. Gall.* this prayer is twice called "Collectio super munera" (Nos. 29, 33), and thrice has the rubric "Collectio sequitur" (Nos. 31, 36, 39).

⁴ Often called "Contestatio."

⁵ Very often entitled "Post secreta."

⁶ The Mozarabic "Missa" is always an invitory formula, never a prayer properly so called.

⁷ The words "Qui pridie" are not now found in the Mozarabic Mass, as may be seen in *P.L.* lxxxv. 116 and 550. That they were formerly used is, however, unmistakably attested by the title of the following prayer, still called "Post pridie." (*Dublin Review*, pp. 581, 115; Cagin, p. 55.)

⁸ It has been already pointed out (chap. vii.) that the original position of the Roman collect was after the Gospel, a trace of which usage still survives in the Mass of the Pre-sanctified on Good Friday.

⁹ The "Te igitur" and "Unde et memores" correspond in position but not in general structure to the Gallican "Post Sanctus" and "Post pridie." See above, chap. x.

¹⁰ Five times in the *M. Goth.* (Nos. 4, 6, 8, 11, 12), and seven times in the *Sacr. Gall.* (Nos. 4, 17, 26—29, 33) this prayer has the rubric "Collectio sequitur." Many Masses have no "proper" post-eucharistic prayers, just as in the Roman Missal many Masses have no "proper" secreta or postcommunion.

¹¹ Note that, whereas of the two formulæ which accompany the *Pater Noster*, both vary in the Gallican, only the first is changed from day to day in the Mozarabic, and neither in the Roman rite.

¹² An instructive instance of the way in which an invariable prayer in one rite may precisely answer to a variable prayer in another.

There is perhaps some reason to fear that the foregoing table, though clear enough to its compiler, may yet puzzle the reader who approaches the subject for the first time. It may therefore be well to take it piece by piece, and to begin with the middle section (Nos. 5-9), repeating it in an abridged form.

<i>Gallican</i>	<i>Mozarabic</i>	<i>Roman</i>
{ 5. IMMOLATIO.	ILLATIO.	PREFACE.
6. POST SANCTUS.	POST SANCTUS.	"Te igitur," &c.
{ 7. POST MYSTERIA.	POST PRIDIE.	"Unde et memores," &c.
{ 8. ANTE ORATIONEM	AD ORATIONEM	"Praeceptis salutaribus," &c.
DOMINICAM.	DOMINICAM.	
{ 9. POST ORATIONEM	Post O. D.	"Libera nos,"
DOMINICAM.	(invariable).	&c.

Now it is plain that the Gallican "Immolatio" and the Mozarabic "Illatio" are structurally identical with the Roman Preface, from which they differ only in title and in verbal text. And how closely the prayers "Ante Orationem Dominicam" and "Post Orationem Dominicam" of the Gallican rite correspond, in general purport, with the Roman "Preceptis Salutaribus," &c., and "Libera nos," &c., has already been shown. So much, then, for Nos. 5, 8, and 9 of the table. As regards No. 6, reasons have been given for holding that the Roman "Te igitur," &c., has displaced an earlier "Post Sanctus," similar, at least in general purport, to the Gallican. And lastly, the Gallican "Post Mysteria" (No. 7) usually though not invariably has, like the Roman "Unde et memores," &c., the

character of an anamnesis or prayer of remembrance.

Hence the one great structural difference between the Roman and the Gallican rite, as regards the central portion of the Mass, lies in the presence of intercessory prayers in the Roman Canon, and it can, I think, hardly be doubted that in this respect the Gallican arrangement represents an earlier stage in the development of the liturgy. There remain the three couples numbered respectively 1—2 (the Praefatio and Collectio sequens), 3—4 (the C. post Nomina and the C. ad Pacem), and 10—11 (the post Eucharistiam and the Consummatio Missae). That in a general way the Gallican Collectio sequens (and the Mozarabic Alia Oratio) answers to the Roman collect, the Oratio ad Pacem to the Roman Secreta, and the Consummatio Missae to the Roman Postcommunion, there can be no reasonable doubt. Lest, however, any question should be raised about the relation of the Collectio ad Pacem to the Secreta, I will give here a few specimens of Gallican prayers ad Pacem.

“Suscipe, quaesumus, Domine, *hostiam placationis et laudis*; et has oblationes famulorum famularumque tuarum . . . placatus assume.”¹

“Laetificet nos, quaesumus, Domine, *munus oblatum*, ut . . . tuae sumamus indulgentiae largitatem.”²

“Suscipe, Domine, preces populi tui *cum oblationibus hostiarum*: ut paschalibus initiati mysteriis,

¹ *M. Goth.* n. 37.

² *Ibid.* n. 56.

ad aeternitatis . . . medelam, te operante, proficiant," &c.¹

I do not of course pretend that more than a minority of the "Collectiones ad Pacem" are of this type, or that those which are of this type can be regarded as equally primitive in structure with the more numerous collects ad Pacem in which there is an explicit petition for peace; but the unquestionable fact that the old peace-collect gradually became assimilated in character to the Roman secreta, to which (as may be seen in the Bobbio Missal) it finally gave place, appears to me to amount to a clear proof—if indeed any proof were needed—that the prayers corresponded at least in position.²

Further, that the Gallican Praefatio Missae, like the Mozarabic "Missa" was, originally, not an independent prayer, but an invitation to pray, prefixed to the first true collect, has been pointed out by Mgr. Duchesne, by the present writer in the *Dublin Review*, and lastly by Father Cagin. For the sake of emphasizing the point the following words may be quoted: "A careful examination of the Gallican Masses in the five Sacramentaries reveals the fact that the Praefatio was originally a hortatory address to the people, a 'bidding prayer,' or invitation to pray, and that the collect which immediately follows is the prayer which answers to the invitation. This is in-

¹ *M. Gall.* n. 27.

² It has been mentioned above that the "Collectio ad Pacem" occasionally has the title "Super munera."

dedicated by the word 'sequitur,' which in so large a number of instances qualifies the . . . collect (*i.e.*, *praemissa praefatione collectio sequitur*)."¹ So too Father Cagin writes: "La *Praefatio missae* gallicane est generalment une monition aux fideles, une courte invitation a s'orienter dans le sens qu'elle indique, et c'est ce que realise la formule suivante. Le nom *Collectio sequitur*, donné a sette formule, semble choisi à dessein pour exprimer formellement sa relation avec la *Praefatio missae*."²

That the "Post Eucharistiam" holds a like relation to the "Consummatio Missae" has also been noticed by the same three writers, and there is, indeed, no difficulty in verifying the statement.

But it is strange that neither Mgr. Duchesne nor Father Cagin should have observed that precisely the same thing is true of the "Collectio post Nomina" and the "Collectio ad Pacem." In the Reichenau Mass-book, which is the most archaic specimen of its class, out of six "collectiones post nomina," no less than five have the invitatory form.³ In the Missale Gothicum, out of sixty-nine Masses which admit of comparison, twenty-one have a "collectio post nomina" in this same form.⁴ The Gallicanum has four, and the Bobbio Missal six in-

¹ *Dublin Review*, l.c. pp. 582, 583 abridged. The writer was mistaken in saying that the fact had been "not hitherto noticed," for it had been very clearly stated by M. Duchesne (*Origines*, pp. 197f.).

² Cagin, p. 54.

³ Nos. 2, 3, 6, 8, 11.

⁴ These instances are too numerous to be cited in detail.

stances of similar "collectiones post nomina."¹ The proportion, indeed, is not so large as in the case of the "praefatio Missae" and of the "post Eucharistiam."² But the facts show clearly that there was a strong tendency for such prefatory formulæ to pass into simple prayers,—mere duplicates, so to say, of the collects which they had originally served to introduce. And although no one could have predicted on *à priori* grounds that it would be so, there is nothing to excite surprise in the circumstance that this tendency seems to have operated sooner in the case of the "collectio post nomina" than in that of the "praefatio Missae" or of the "post Eucharistiam." That the "post nomina" was in fact the first of the three prefatory prayers to lose its prefatory character, appears not merely from the fact that it has retained this character in a relatively smaller number of extant instances, but from the still more significant fact that, in his treatise, "De Officiis," St. Isidore speaks of it as an independent prayer, whereas he recognizes the "praefatio Missae" as a true bidding prayer or invitatory.³ In his time, therefore, the former had

¹ *M. Gall.* Nos. 1, 26, 35, 39; *M. Bobb.* Nos. 8, 10, 15, 36, 52, 54.

² Of post-eucharistic prayers which have the prefatory form, there are fourteen in the four Gallican books taken together. Of "post nomina" which have the same form, there are 37. But the total number of collects "post nomina" is much larger (133) than that of collects "post Eucharistiam" (27).

³ Of the "Missa," he says: "Prima oratio *admonitionis* est erga populum, ut excitemur ad exorandum Deum," but of the "Oratio ad Pacem" he writes: "Quarta post hæc infertur pro osculo pacis, ut charitate reconciliati," &c. (*De Officiis*, i. 15; *Dublin Review*, p. 580.)

lost, while the latter still retained, its prefatory function.

There is, however, something more to be said before leaving this part of the subject. It has been already asserted that "in a general way" the Gallican "collectio sequens" answers to the first or principal collect of the Roman Mass. To speak more precisely, it answers to it in two particulars, (*a*) as being the chief collect of the Mass, and (*b*) as holding the first place among the variable prayers properly so-called, *i.e.*, as distinct from mere invitations to pray. To this may be added the circumstance that a considerable number of Gallican "collectiones sequentes" are verbally, or all but verbally, identical with Roman collects. The position, however, of the Gallican "collectio sequens" was, as has been said, not that which the Roman collect now holds. For, together of course with its invitatory, it followed the Gospel. But reasons have been given, in Chapters vii. and viii., for believing that the position of the chief collect in the Roman Mass has been altered, and that it, too, originally followed the Gospel. "A curious and instructive instance of this transfer having actually been made is found in the 'Missa Ecclesiae Romanae' of the Stowe Missal, when compared with the 'Cottidiana Romensis' of the Bobbio Mass-book. The Bobbio Mass embodies the Roman Canon in a thoroughly Gallican framework, with its full complement of collects in their Gallican position. Now, every one of these prayers is found also in the first Mass of the Stowe Missal, but with

this difference—that the two first collects (*i.e.*, one which in the Gallican Ordo ought to be a *præfatio* or bidding prayer, and the *collectio sequens*) appear in the Stowe Missal in the Roman position, before the Scripture lessons.”¹

In conclusion a reflection may be permitted on the ultimate suppression, or supersession, partly under papal but partly also under imperial influence, of the early Gallican rite in favour of the Roman, a change which some Anglican writers have seen fit to deplore. The following paragraphs were, in substance, written many years ago, and there seems to be no good reason for modifying them except in the way of a slight curtailment.²

1. No one who has not carefully examined for himself the early Gallican sacramentaries can have any adequate idea of the extraordinary want of uniformity which they present. It must be enough to say that out of about 175 Masses which the six Missals (including the Stowe Missal) contain, there are not three which are common to any two of the books. Indeed, it would seem that the only Mass which really had a kind of fixed identity was the “*Missa cottidiana Romensis*,” which appears in the Bobbio and in the Stowe Missals, and of which a fragment has survived in the “*M. Gothicum*.”

2. Not less remarkable than the want of uniformity among the Gallican books themselves, is

¹ *Dublin Review*, Oct. 1893, p. 585. For the sake of clearness I have made one or two slight verbal corrections in the above passage.

² *Dublin Review*, Jan. 1894, pp. 129 ff.

the fact that a very large proportion of the variable prayers which they contain are found also in the Roman sacramentaries, from which even Neale and Forbes admit that they must have been for the most part borrowed. Moreover, with the exception of the fragmentary Reichenau Missal, every one of the other books contains evidence of the occasional use of the Roman Canon, or of portions thereof. Indeed, nothing can be more clear than that long before the time of Pepin and Charlemagne the Roman rite had begun to obtain a firm footing in Gaul.¹

Here then was a state of things in the Gallican Church which manifestly clamoured for a reform, and what reform could have been more reasonable than to substitute for the unstable and undeveloped liturgical system of Gaul the fixed and clear-cut Roman rite with its fully developed calendar of seasons and festivals?

3. Nevertheless, nothing can be more clear than that this reform was not thrust upon the Gallican Church by the Roman Pontiffs.² The very substitution of the Roman for the old Gallican rite was gradually effected throughout the West, with the cordial co-operation, indeed, of the Roman pontiffs, but by no means at their unduly urgent request.

¹ This truth has been set forth in the clearest light by Dom S. Bäumer in his study of the Gelasianum. It would be impossible here to indicate the fresh evidence by which he proves to demonstration the strong influence of the Roman rite in Gaul in the sixth, seventh, and eighth centuries.

² Marchesi, *La Liturgia Gallicana* (Rome, 1867), ii. 205 ff.; Bäumer, *Sacr. Gelas.* pp. 49 ff.

For any trace of an attempt on the part of the Popes to suppress with a high hand the ancient Gallican liturgy we seek in vain.¹

4. It was not until the eleventh century that the substitution of the Roman for the older local liturgy (substantially identical with the Gallican) was effected in Spain. The story of the substitution is a complicated one and cannot be attempted here.² But two points stand out clearly when the documents are dispassionately examined—viz., (*a*) that the Roman See was prepared to defend the cause of the Spanish liturgy when it was unjustly attacked on dogmatic grounds; and (*b*) that it was not until the Roman rite had gained a footing in Spain, and was supported by a strong party in Aragon and Castile, that Gregory VII. authoritatively urged its universal adoption. It is, of course, easy to ascribe this action of St. Gregory to “that intolerance of other rites,” which—in the words of an Anglican writer—has so incalculably “injured ecclesiastical antiquity.” It would perhaps be wiser as well as more modest, if only in view of the moderation of earlier Pontiffs, to give even Pope Hildebrand credit for some other motive than a spirit of narrow-minded exclusiveness or tyrannical intolerance. There were, after all, more im-

¹ On the gradual supersession of the Gallican rite see Fortescue, pp. 177 ff.

² The chief authorities are (1) *Regesta Gregorii VII.* in *P.L.* cxlviii.; (2) Pien (Pinus) *De Liturgia Mozarabica* in the Bollandist *Acta SS.* (Julii, vi. 1—112); (3) Gams, *Kirchengeschichte von Spanien*, ii. 441—462.

portant interests at stake than the preservation of interesting liturgical relics for the satisfaction of students in centuries to come. We must not judge of the condition of the Spanish liturgy solely by the Mozarabic Missal in the form in which it has come down to us from the time of Cardinal Ximenes. Had such a Missal been in universal use in Spain, we may confidently assume that St. Gregory VII. would have left it in undisturbed possession. But liturgical chaos was quite another matter. And were we in possession of all the circumstances we should probably find ourselves compelled to admit that for this state of chaos the adoption of the Roman rite was the only remedy. How far from the mind of the Roman See is the indiscriminating suppression of "other rites" may be gathered from the measures taken by Pius IX. and by Leo XIII. for the preservation of the local liturgical usages of the Basilian monastery of Grotta Ferrata, hardly a dozen miles from Rome.

THE END.

INDEX.

- Acclamation**, "Amen" as, ii. 3, 5, 41.
- Action** ("Actio"), The, including Preface with Canon, ii. 1 f., 17 f., 64 f., &c.
- Africa**, Church in, of Roman origin; ii. 17; liturgy of, lessons in, i. 79; position of Pax in, ii. 80 f.
- "Agnus Dei,"** introduced by Sergius I., ii. 60 f., 79 f.; in rite of Communion, 83 f.; in "Gloria in excelsis," ii. 79 n.
- Alcuin**, revises Gregorianum, i. 39; attributes transl. of "Gloria" to St. Hilary, 58.
- Alexander I.**, said to have introduced "Qui pridie," ii. 33, 99; commemorated in Mass, 91.
- Alleluia antiphon**, The, i. 80; ii. 86.
- Altar**, The, of Calvary, i. 7; Eucharistic, relics under, i. 12; ii. 88; Apocalyptic, i. 12, 23; ii. 39, 88.
- Amberger**, Dr., on the parts of the Mass, summarized in chapt. iii.; see i. 30 n.
- Ambrose**, St., his tract "de Mysteriis," i. 51; probably author of "de Sacramentis," i. 51; ii. 67 f.
- Ambrosian Liturgy**, The, of Milan, i. 56, 88, 91; ii. 53, 55 n., 94.
- "Amen,"** as acclamation at end of Eucharistic prayer and Canon, ii. 3, 5, 41; in body of Canon a sign of intercalation, ii. 44 f.
- "Anamnesis,"** The, a prayer of remembrance following the consecration, ii. 35 f.
- "Anaphora,"** The, *i.e.* that portion of the Mass which commences with the Preface and extends to the Fraction, ii. 2, 7, 14, &c.
- Anastasius**, compiler of the "Liber Pontificalis," ii. 11, 76; cf. i. 80 f.
- Antiphony**, The, i. 34.
- Antiphons** as part of the liturgy, ii. 85 f.
- Apocalypse**, Altar in the, i. 12, 23; ii. 39, 88.
- Apocryphal** liturgical documents, Value of their testimony, ii. 9 f.
- Apostles**, The, "the custom of," ii. 72; commemorated in Mass 89 ff.
- "Apostolic Constitutions,"** The, ii. 10, 73.
- Apostolic tradition** in liturgical matters, ii. 17, 35, 63.
- Archdeacon**, Function of, in Papal ceremony, i. 106.
- Augustine** of Hippo, St., his testimony concerning Scripture lessons, i. 79, 85; a doubtful authority on position of Pax, ii. 81 n.
- Banquet**, or meal, The sacrificial, its antitype in the H. Eucharist, i. 5 f.
- Bäumer**, S., on the Gelasianum, i. 39 f.; ii. 113 n.
- Beissel**, S., on gradual systematization of Scripture lessons, &c., i. 85 f.

- "**Benedicamus Domino**," in place of "Ite, missa est," its purport, i. 61 f.
- "**Benedictus qui venit**," &c., ii. 12 f., 85; and see "Sanctus."
- Berno**, of Reichnau, liturgiologist, i. 58, 92.
- Bernold**, of Constance, probably author of the "Micrologus," ii. 43 n.
- Bishop**, Consecration of, offerings at, i. 107.
- Bishop**, Edmond, on Roman Mass-books, i. 40 n.; on historical study of liturgy, 46.
- Blood**, The, a symbol of life, its significance in sacrifice, i. 17.
- Bobbio Missal**, The, i. 90; ii. 102, 108 f., 111; and see "Gallican Mass-books."
- Bona**, Cardinal, "de Rebus Liturgicis," i. 52 and *passim*.
- Boniface I.**, Letter of, to Emperor, ii. 62.
- Brightman**, F. E., on abuse of conjectural hypotheses, ii. 18; his "Eastern Liturgies" referred to, *passim*.
- Cabrol**, F., on the Leonianum, i. 40 n., on relation of psalmody and collects to lessons, 86 n., 87 n.; on Kiss of Peace, ii. 81 f.; on Roman origin of Gallican rite, ii. 96.
- Cagin**, P., on Roman origin of Gallican rite, ii. 96 ff., 108 ff., and chapt. xvi. *passim*.
- Canon**, The Roman, not primitive throughout, ii. 16; development of, gradual and orderly, ii. 42 ff., 49 ff.; external testimony to, ii. 59 ff.; organic unity of, ii. 19, 30; intercessory prayers in, ii. 21, 56 f.; position of, in Missal, i. 36 f.
- Canonisation**, Original Meaning of, ii. 90; rite of, offerings at, i. 107 f.
- "**Cantatorium**," The, a local Roman term, i. 34.
- Catechism**, The, i. 1.
- Catechumens**, Dismissal of, i. 97 ff., ii. 82; instruction and selection of, by "Scrutinies," i. 98 ff.
- Celestine I.**, introduces psalmody "before the sacrifice," i. 54, 80, 89; letter of, on intercessory prayers in Mass, i. 89 n., ii. 62.
- Celtic use**, The, ii. 55 n., 102; and see "Stowe Missal."
- Child's Hymns**, i. 53, 59, 111.
- Choir**, The; see "Schola Cantorum."
- Choral parts of the Mass**, The, i. 33, 54; ii. 84 f.
- Christ**, Jesus; see "Jesus Christ."
- "**Church Ordinances**," The; see "Ordinances, Ethiopic."
- Clement of Rome**, St., his alleged testimony to use of "Tersanctus," ii. 5 f.
- "**Clementine**" **Liturgy**, The, ii. 10; and see "Apostolic Constitutions."
- Collect**, The, i. 65 ff.; meaning of term, 65 f.; analysis of prayer, 69 ff.; chant of, 73; typical examples of, 76 f.; original position and subsequent transference of, 80 ff., 87 ff., 90; ii. 82, 111 f.; invitational forms prefixed to, i. 73 ff.; Good Friday Collects, 73, 75, and see "Preces solemnes"; Gallican, see "Collectio."
- "**Collectio**," Gallican equivalent of Roman "Collecta," but of wider application, i. 66; ii. 105 ff.; names of ("c. sequens," "post nomina,"

- "ad pacem," "post Sanctus," "post Mysteria," "post Eucharistiam," &c.), i. 66; ii. 104 ff., and chapt. xvi. *passim*; "collectio post Sanctus," specimen of, ii. 53.
- "Commune Sanctorum,"** or "Common of Saints," The, in Roman Missal, i. 37.
- "Communicantes,"** prayer in the Canon, ii. 21 ff.; relation with "Te igitur," 27; position of, not the result of transference, 29, 44; saints commemorated in, 89; not duplicated in later list, 29, 89.
- "Communio,"** an antiphon, originally a psalm, chanted while the faithful received Communion, ii. 84 f.
- Communion of the faithful,** the rite of, ii. 83 f.
- "Conclusion,"** *i.e.* the words "per Christum," &c.; see "Per Christum."
- "Confiteor,"** The, i. 50; ii. 89.
- Congruity** in the institution of the Holy Eucharist, as in the economy of the Incarnation, i. 21 f.
- Conjecture,** Need of caution in use of, ii. 17 f.
- Connolly, R. H.,** on alleged "great intercession" in early Roman Canon, ii. 20 n.; on St. Justin's testimony, 51 ff.
- Consecration,** Congruity of the double, i. 20 ff.; effected by the words of institution, ii. 49; form of words accompanying, ii. 34 ff.; and see "Qui pridie."
- Coptic Liturgy,** The, points of agreement with the Roman, ii. 100 f.
- Creed, The Nicene,** in the Mass, i. 91 f., ii. 84; the Apostles', "delivery" of to catechumens, i. 99, 100 f.
- Damasus, St.,** perhaps introduced variable prayers into Roman liturgy, i. 43; no evidence for "drastic reform" by, ii. 95.
- Dankgebet** = "Thankprayer," The, ii. 11; and see "Eucharistic Prayer."
- Deacon, Functions of,** in the liturgy, i. 47 f., 106 f., ii. 3, 5, 86; deacon's litany in Eastern rites, see "Litany."
- Decentius, Bp. of Gubbio,** Letter of Innocent I. to; see "Innocent I."
- Deputy celebrant, The,** in Byzantine Prothesis, i. 93 f.
- "De Sacramentis,"** The, ascribed, perhaps rightly, to St. Ambrose, i. 52; testimony of, to text of Canon, ii. 67 f.
- Destruction,** how far essential to notion of sacrifice, i. 14 ff.
- Development,** divergent, in Roman and Gallican liturgy, ii. 94 ff.; of Roman Canon, see "Canon."
- Devotion,** private, leading to custom and law in liturgy, i. 58, 60 f.
- "Diakonika,"** the deacon's litany in Eastern rites; see "Litany."
- "Diesque nostros,"** &c., at conclusion of "Hanc igitur," ii. 32; introduced or fixed by Gregory I., 60; found in "Gregorianised" Gelasianum, *ibid.* note.
- Dptycha, The,** reading of, ii. 27 f.; abuse in connection with, 28; and see "Memento."

- Dismissal**, The, (1) of catechumens and (2) of faithful, accounts for the terms "Missa" and "Missarum solemnity," i. 60 f., 63 f.; place of (1) in the liturgy, 96 ff.; obsolete before A.D. 700, probably before 600, i. 101, cf. ii. 82.
- "Domine, non sum dignus,"** before Communion of celebrant, ii. 83; before C. of faithful, 84.
- "Dona nobis pacem,"** replaced "Miserere nobis," except in Lateran, ii. 79 f.
- Duchesne**, Mgr., i. 80 n.; ii. 99 n., 108 f., &c.
- "Ectené,"** the deacon's litany in Eastern rites; see "Litany."
- Embolism**, The, *i.e.* prayer after Pater noster in Roman and Gallican liturgy, ii. 69 f.; characteristic features of, in Western as contrasted with Eastern liturgies, 101 ff.
- Ephesus**, Description of liturgy at, ii. 4 ff.; and see "Justin, St."
- Epiklesis**, Origin and purport of, ii. 46 ff.; position of, 47 f.; referred to by Gelasius, 49; formerly in Roman liturgy, (?) 46; in Gallican and Mozarabic, 49.
- Epistle**, The, chanting of, i. 82; sequence of pericopae, 84.
- Eucharistic Prayer**, The (= "Anaphora" = "Prex" = "Dankgebet" = Preface *plus* Canon), originally continuous, ii. 2, 44, 56; and see "Anaphora," &c.
- "Evangeliarium,"** The, i. 33.
- "Faithful, Prayer of the,"** in primitive and Eastern liturgies, i. 89 f.; correspondence with "preces (or, orationes) solemnes," and discontinuance in Roman liturgy, 104 f.
- "Fermentum,"** The, *i.e.* the Holy Eucharist carried from Papal Mass to bishops and priests "in communion" with the Holy See, rite and significance of, ii. 76 ff.
- Fire**, Purifying effects and symbolism of, in sacrifice, i. 17 f.
- Fortescue**, Dr. A., on reading of lessons, i. 82; on the Byzantine Prothesis, &c., 93 f.; on dismissal of catechumens, 101; on "preces (or orationes, solemnes)," 102 f.; on Gallican elements in Roman liturgy, 110; on the Canon, its structure, &c., ii. 21 ff.; on the rite of the "fermentum" (q.v.), ii. 76 ff.; on the position of the Pax, 80 ff.; on the rite of Communion, 83 f.; on the Canon, 94 ff. *passim*; on the saints commemorated in the Canon, 90 ff.; &c., &c.
- Fraction**, The, original significance of, &c., ii. 75 ff.
- Gallican Liturgy**, The, its relation to the Roman, i. 44 f., ii. 69 ff., 94 ff. and *passim*; suppression of, 102 ff.
- Gallican Mass-books**, Conventional titles of, i. 44 n.; contents of, ii. 55 f., 102, 105 ff.; vagaries of, 42, 112; Roman elements in, 113.
- Gallican Prayers**, Examples of, ii. 53 f., 70 f., 107 f.
- Gasquet**, F. A., on apostolic tradition in the Canon, ii. 35 n.
- Gaul**, Churches in, Roman origin of, ii. 17.

- "**Gelasianum**," The, i. 40 ff., 97, 99; ii. 15, 60.
- Gelasius I.**, St., his Mass-book, see "**Gelasianum**"; "**Canon dominicus P. Gilasi**" 61 f.; perhaps suppressed Epiklesis, ii. 49.
- Germanus**, Bp. of Auxerre, St. on the Gallican liturgy, i. 80 n., 90 n.
- "**Gloria in excelsis**," The hymn, introduction of, &c., i. 57 f.; cf. ii. 84.
- Good Friday**, Prayers and ceremonies of, see "**Preces solemnes**," and "**Prostration**."
- Gospel**, Ceremonies at chanting of, i. 81 f.; choice of "**pericopae**," see "**Lessons**"; originally preceded chief collect, see "**Collect**."
- Gospels**, "**Delivery**" of, to catechumens, i. 99 f.
- Gradual**, The, origin of name, i. 83; chanted by deacon (? subdeacon), 82; place in the liturgy, ii. 86.
- "**Great Intercession**," The; see "**Intercession, Great**."
- "**Gregorianum**," The, *i.e.* St. Gregory's Mass-book and derivative MSS., i. 32, 38 ff., 41 n., 55, and *passim*.
- Gregory I.**, St., liturgical reforms of, ii. 15; on "**Kyrie Eleison**," i. 55; reduces number of Prefaces, ii. 15; introduces changes in Canon, ii. 60; on position of **Pater noster** in the liturgy, ii. 71 ff.; his letter to John of Syracuse, i. 55; ii. 71 ff.; his Mass-book, see "**Gregorianum**."
- Gregory VII.**, St., suppresses old Spanish (Mozarabic) liturgy, ii. 114 f.
- Grotta Ferrata**, Basilian monastery of, Byzantine liturgy maintained at, ii. 115.
- "**Hanc igitur**," The prayer, ii. 31 f., 37 ff., 68.
- High Mass**, i. 47 f.
- Hilary**, St., reputed translator of "**Gloria**," i. 57 f.
- Hymns**, Place of, in the liturgy, ii. 84 f.; children's, i. 53, 59, 111.
- Ignatius Loyola**, St., method of prayer, i. 59.
- "**Illumination**," synonym for baptism, i. 98 f.
- Innocent I.**, Letter of, to Decentius, ii. 16 f., 62 ff., 77, 82.
- Institution of H. Eucharist**, Record of, in Canon, ii. 34 f.; words of, consecration effected by, 49.
- "**Intercession, The Great**," in Eastern liturgies, ii. 20, 57; alleged inclusion of, in early Roman rite, 20 n., 29, 57, 66.
- Intercession of Saints**, invoked, ii. 88.
- Intercessory Prayers in Canon**, not primitive but of early introduction, ii. 56 f.; analysis and discussion of, 20 ff.; and see "**Te igitur**," "**Communicantes**," "**Hanc igitur**," "**Mementos**," and "**Nobis quoque**."
- Introit**, The, i. 54 ff., ii. 85; cf. i. 85; in Byzantine liturgy, i. 94 f.; the psalm "**Judica**" and, i. 51.
- Invitatories**, or invitatory formulae prefixed to prayers, on Good Friday, i. 73 ff.; in the Gelasianum, 74; "**Orate fratres**" an example of, *ibid.*; in Gallican liturgy, i. 74; ii. 103, 107 ff.

Irish Missal, see "Stowe Missal," "St. Gall MS.," and "Celtic Use."

"**Itē Missa est**," originally a real dismissal, chanting of. i. 60 ff.

Jenner, Mr., on obliteration, in Roman rite, of distinction between "Missa catechumenorum" and "M. fidelium," ii. 82.

Jerome, St., on abuse in reading of diptychs, ii. 28.

Jesus Christ, Unique perfection of His Priesthood, i. 9 ff.; His threefold office as Prophet, Priest and King exercised in and through the Mass, i. 24 ff.; the "most dear Son" of the Father, ii. 32; all prayers offered through, i. 72; cf. ii. 23 f. 32 ff., 40.

John the Baptist, St., commemorated in "Nobis quoque," 90 f.

John the Deacon, biographer of St. Gregory, i. 40; ii. 60.

John, Bp. of Syracuse, Letter of St. Gregory to, i. 55; ii. 71 ff.

"**Judica**," The psalm, a kind of "private introit," i. 51; St. Ambrose (?) on, 51 f.

Justin Martyr, St., Description by, of liturgy at Ephesus, ii. 2 ff., 51; cf. i. 83; ii. 11, 41, 80 n.; "Apology" of, ii. 2, 4; "Dialogue" of, ii. 4.

King, Jesus Christ as, in the liturgy, i. 24, 29 f.

"**Kyrie Eleison**," in the Roman rite, replaced older litanies, St. Gregory on, i. 55 f.; a "hymn" in the wide sense of the term, ii. 84.

Lamb, The, in the Apocalypse, i. 23; and see "Agnus Dei."

Leaven, The Eucharistic, ii. 78; and see "Fermentum."

Lectionary, i. 33.

Lectors, Office of, i. 82.

Lenten Masses, "Benedicamus Domino" and "Oratio super populum" in, i. 61 f.

Leo I., St., on the Sacrifice of the New Law, i. 6; passages from embodied in the *Leonianum* (q. v.), 42; introduces "sanctum sacrificium, &c., into the Canon, ii. 38 n.

Leo XIII., and the liturgy at Grotta Ferrata, ii. 115.

"**Leonianum**," The, contemporary with St. Leo, but not compiled by him, i. 42 ff.; an unofficial compilation, 43; multiplicity of Masses in, probably reflect usage of various local churches, *ibid.*; prayers in, ascribed to St. Damasus, *ibid.*; survivals from in Roman Missal, *ibid.*; contains no Canon, 44, but has variants of "Hanc igitur," ii. 60; the earliest Roman Mass-book, i. 44.

Lessons, Scriptural, in liturgy, i. 78 ff.; number of, *ibid.*; choice of, 83 ff.; survivals of continuous sequence, 84 f.; system of, gradually developed, 86 f.; appropriateness of, for particular feasts, 84; St. Augustine on, 86 n.; for "Scrutiny" Mass, 99; relation with subsidiary collects, 87.

"**Liber Pontificalis**," The, i. 54, 57, 80 f.; ii. 11, 33, 38 n., 60 n., 76, 99.

"**Libera nos**," after Pater noster, ii. 75, 92, 99, 101 ff.; see "Embolism."

- Litany**, A, displaced by the "Kyrie Eleison," i. 55; the "greater" litanies presuppose "lesser," now lost, 56 f., 89 f., cf. 96; ii. 4 n.; of deacon in Eastern liturgies, ii. 4 n., 20 n., 57.
- Liturgies**, Eastern, characteristic features of, ii. 97-101; Prothesis and Enarxis, i. 63 ff.; "Diakonika," "Ectené," "Synapté," see "Litany"; "Great Intercession" in, see "Intercession"; duplication of intercessory formulae in, ii. 57.
- Liturgies**, Western, Roman origin of, i. 44. ff., ii. 94 ff.; features common to and distinctive of, 97 ff., and chapt. xvi. *passim*.
- Low Mass**, a reduced form of High Mass, i. 47 f.
- Lugo**, Cardinal de, Opinion of, on essence of Eucharistic Sacrifice, i. 15, 22.
- Martyrs**, commemorated in Canon, ii. 89 f.; and see "Relics."
- Mary**, The B.V., her intercession invoked in "Confiteor," ii. 89; commemorated in offertory prayers, *ibid.*; in the Canon, ii. 28, 89; in "Libera nos," 92.
- Mass**, The, meaning of word, i. 63 f.; festal and ferial, 32; votive, 37; "High" and "Low," 47 f.; methods of hearing, 59, cf. 27 f.
- Mementos**, The, ii. 20 ff., 26 ff., 43 f., 66 f.; transferred from offertory, 26, 44, 58; hence parenthetic in Canon, 28; probable reasons for separation of, 26; connection with diptychs, 27 f.; for the dead, 29, 39.
- "Micrologus,"** The, a liturgical tract, i. 61 n.; ii. 43 n., &c.
- "Missa,"** Meaning of word, i. 63 f.; "Missa cottidiana Romensis," *i.e.* a Mass for daily use according to Roman rite, in Gallican and Celtic books, i. 34, 90; ii. 34; see "Mass." "Missa" in Mozarabic liturgy, ii. 104, 108.
- Missal**; see "Missale," and "Stowe Missal."
- "Missale Gallicanum"** (or "Sacramentarium Gallicanum") and "Missale Gothicum," Gallican Mass-books, i. 44 n.; ii. 56, 102 ff.
- Missale Romanum**, The, description and analysis of, i. 31 ff.; origin and ancestry of, 32 f., 38 ff.; distinguished from "Sacramentary," 33 f.; supplements to, 38.
- Mozarabic Liturgy**, of Toledo, &c., i. 95; ii. 33, 95, 102 ff.; suppression of, ii. 114 f.
- "Mysteries,"** The, *i.e.* the consecration or the entire "action," in Roman rite, ii. 65. "Mysteria" in Gallican rite = the consecration; cf. ii. 104 ff.
- Names**, mentioned or proclaimed in Roman liturgy, (1) of Pope, Emperor, Bishop, ii. 62, 66; (2) of particular persons, benefactors, &c., ii. 27 f., 63, 66; and see "Mementos." "Nomina" in Gallican liturgy, ii. 44, 104 ff.
- "Nobis quoque,"** in Roman Canon, ii. 21, 45; saints mentioned in, relation to list in "Communicantes," 22, 29, 90 ff.

- "Oblata,"** The, i. 93; before and after consecration, ii. 37 f.; relation to prayers of commendation, 64; kinds of, other than bread and wine, i. 105; ii. 40.
- Offertory,** The, i. 93 ff.; changes in, 96; in mediæval Rome, 106 f.; at Milan, 107; prayers at, of late introduction and Gallican provenance, 108 f.; psalm or antiphon at, ii. 85; and see "Oblata."
- "Orate, fratres,"** i. 74; ii. 86.
- "Oratio Dominica";** see "Pater Noster."
- "Oratio oblationis"** in St. Gregory's letter, meaning of, ii. 72 ff.; in Funk's tr. of Serapion, 74.
- "Oratio super Populum,"** significance of, i. 62 f.
- "Oratio super Sindonem,"** in Ambrosian rite, i. 88, 91.
- "Orationes solemnes";** see "Preces solemnes." "Orationes et preces," title in Gelasianum, i. 42.
- Orders,** Anglican, Vindication of Bull on, i. 1 f.
- "Ordinances,"** Ethiopic, liturgy in, ii. 7, 13, 73, &c.
- Ordinary,** of Mass, i. 31, 108; Gallican prayers in, 110.
- Ordination,** to priesthood, what it involves, i. 12.
- "Ordines Romani,"** i. 50 f., 55, 97, 100; ii. 66 f.
- "Ordo,"** as title in Gelasianum, i. 42.
- "Pater Noster,"** St. Gregory on position of, ii. 69 ff. "Little Preface" and "embolism" of, see "Praefatiuncula" and "Embolism."
- Pax,** The, position and transference of, i. 105; ii. 75, 80 ff.; in Gallican liturgy, 104 f., 107 f.
- Peace,** Petitions for, ii. 74; kiss of, see "Pax."
- "Per Christum,"** &c.; this or similar form the "conclusion" of all collects, &c., i. 72; expresses fundamental idea linking Preface with Canon, &c., ii. 23, 40.
- "Per quem haec omnia,"** &c., in Roman Canon, significance of words, ii. 40.
- Peter, St.,** Roman liturgical tradition derived from, ii. 17; invoked and commemorated in Mass, 89, 92.
- Pius IX.,** and the liturgy at Grotta Ferrata, ii. 115.
- Pius X.** and liturgical reform, ii. 15.
- Postcommunion,** The, assumes that all present have communicated, i. 68; ii. 86.
- "Post Mysteria,"** "Post Prædicationem," Gallican form of the "Anamnesis," &c., ii. 35 f., 104 f.
- "Post Sanctus,"** Gallican prayer following immediately on the Preface, example of, ii. 53; Roman rite probably had this form of prayer, *ibid.*; Ambrosian forms of 55 n.; in Stowe Missal, *ibid.*
- "Praefatio,"** Roman; see "Preface," "Praefatio Missae," Gallican, ii. 104 f.; a bidding prayer, 108 f.
- "Praefatiuncula,"** The, a short preface to the Pater noster, common to Western liturgies, ii. 69 f., 99 ff.
- Prayers,** The, of Mass, classified, i. 31; for all orders and grades, i. 96; and see "Preces."

- "Preces solemnes,"** The, a series of collects following the Gospel on Good Friday, i. 88; formerly in use on other days, 89; but early fell into comparative disuse, 102.
- Preface,** The, in Roman liturgy, ii. 1 ff.; rightly regarded as part of the "Action," with which it was formerly continuous (see "Eucharistic Prayer"); numerous in the Leonianum and Gelasianum, 14 ff.; reduced to 10 by St. Gregory *ibid.*; link of, with "Te igitur," 23.
- "Prex,"** The, old term for Eucharistic Prayer (= Preface *plus* Canon), ii. 16, 12; the composition of a "scholasticus," 16; equivalent to "oratio oblationis," 72 ff.
- Priesthood,** The, of Christ, i. 11, 24.
- Probst, Dr.,** on Roman origin of Gallican liturgy, ii. 96; and works cited *passim*.
- Procession,** before the liturgy, i. 57.
- Profuturus, Bp. of Braga,** Letter of Vigilus to, ii. 61.
- "Proper"** of the Season, of Saints, &c., i. 35.
- Prophetic Office,** The, of Christ, i. 24.
- "Proskomidé"** in Byzantine liturgy, i. 63.
- Prostration,** Rite of, i. 53.
- "Prothesis"** in Byzantine liturgy, i. 63.
- Psalms** in liturgy, i. 51 ff., ii. 85; and see "Judica," "Introit," "Gradual," &c.
- Puniet, P.,** on an Alexandrian Epiklesis, ii. 47 f.
- "Quam oblationem,"** in Canon, ii. 32, 51 ff., 67 f.
- "Qui pridie,"** in Canon, characteristic of Western liturgies, ii. 33, 98 f.
- Reichenau** Mass-book, see "Gallican Mass-books."
- Relics,** under altar, i. 12; ii. 88 f.
- Resurrection,** The, foreshadowed in O.T. sacrifices, i. 23; commemorated in Mass.
- Rome, Papal,** conservative and authoritative, ii. 19.
- Sacrament,** The Eucharistic, relation of, to Sacrifice, i. 1 ff.
- Sacrifice,** Notion and essence of, i. 2 ff., 14 ff., 17; under the Old Law, 2 ff.; ends and kinds of, their distinctive features, each typical of the Sacrifice of the New Law, 3-8; imperfections of, 9 ff.; perfections of Christ's sacrifice, 11; relation of destruction to, 14 ff.; commemorative, conditions of, 19 f.
- St. Gall,** Irish monastery at, liturgical MS. from, relation of to Stowe Missal, 56 n.
- "Sancta,"** The, *i.e.* consecrated particles reserved from Papal Mass, significance of, ii. 76 ff.
- "Sanctum sacrificium,"** &c., Words introduced by St. Leo, ii. 38 n.
- "Sanctus,"** The, or "Tersanctus," absent from earliest liturgies, ii. 4 ff.; alleged testimony of St. Clement to, 5 ff.; introduced at Rome by Xystus I., 11; before Communion in apocryphal "Testament," 12 f.; its words subsumed in all liturgies except Roman, ii. 25, 53 ff.; and see "Post Sanctus."

- Scannell, Dr.**, on the idea of sacrifice, i. 17 f.
Schanz, Dr., on idea of sacrifice, i. 17.
"Schola cantorum," The, i. 33.
"Scholasticus," The, of St. Gregory I., ii. 14, 30, &c.
"Scrutinies," Rite, of, i. 97 ff.; ii. 66 f.
Secreta, The, in Roman rite, i. 65, 68 f., 108; correspondence of, with Gallican "ad pacem," ii. 104, 107 f.
Self-sacrifice, The idea of, involved in all sacrifice, i. 13.
Sequences, ii. 84.
Serapion, Liturgy of, ii. 7 n., 73.
Sergius I., introduced "Agnus Dei," ii. 60 f., 79 f.
Sixtus I.; see "Xystus I."
Slaying of Victim, not the chief item in sacrifice, i. 16 f.
Spain, Churches in, Roman origin of, ii. 17.
Spanish Liturgy, The old, ii. 95; and see "Mozarabic Liturgy."
Stations, The Roman, i. 32, 49 f.; ii. 79.
Stowe Missal, The, i. 34 f., 56, 88 n., 95, 103 n.; ii. 26, 55 n., 79, 111 f.
Substitution, Idea of, in sacrifice, i. 18 f.
Supplements to Missal, i. 38.
"Supplices," prayer in Canon, ii. 39 f., 45 f.; probably substituted for Epiklesis, 46.
Survivals in Roman liturgy, i. 49 f., 53, 55, &c.
"Suscipe S. Trinitas," in Offertory, i. 109; ii. 89; anticipates phrases of Canon, i. 109.
Symmachus, Pope, extends use of "Gloria," i. 58.
Syrian Liturgy, The, ii. 107.
"Te igitur," prayer in Canon, ii. 21 ff., 37 ff., 43 f., 51, 57, 65 f., 68.
Telesphorus, St., and the "Gloria in excelsis," i. 57.
"Temporale," *i.e.* the "Proper of the Season," i. 35.
Tertullian, on the Kiss of Peace, and Fortescue on, ii. 81.
"Testament," The, of our Lord, liturgy in, ii. 12 ff.
"Thankprayer"; see "Dankgebet" and "Eucharistic Prayer."
Thanksgiving, after Communion, ii. 86.
Thurston, H., on Roman Stations, i. 50; on Good Friday prostration, 53 f.; on "Oratio super populum," 62; on sequence of Lenten psalmody, 86 n.; on "Scrutinies," &c., 98 f.
Tract, The, i. 80; ii. 86.
Transference, in liturgical development, of collect, of recital of names, of Pax, ii. 82; of Pater noster, ii. 71 ff.; and see "Collect," "Names," "Pax," "Pater Noster."
Transubstantiation, Dogma of, i. 1 f.; ii. 39.
"Unde et memores," prayer in Canon, ii. 35 ff.
Unleavened bread; ii. 78.
Vazquez, Opinion of, on essence of Eucharistic sacrifice, i. 14, 22.
"Vere Sanctus," a Gallican prayer, see "Post Sanctus."
Vigilius, Pope, letter of to Profuturus, ii. 61.
Votive Mass; i. 37.
Western Liturgies; see "Liturgies."
Wilhelm, Dr., on idea of sacrifice, i. 17 f.
Ximenes, Cardinal, reviser of Mozarabic Missal, ii. 115.
Xystus I., introduces "Sanctus" into Roman liturgy, ii. 11.

THE CATHOLIC LIBRARY

ONE SHILLING NET EACH VOLUME

ALREADY PUBLISHED

VOL. 1.

LETTERS AND INSTRUCTIONS OF ST. IGNATIUS LOYOLA, vol. I.

VOLS. 2 and 4.

A DEFENCE OF ENGLISH CATHOLICS. By William Allen, afterwards Cardinal. With a Preface by His Eminence the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster (2 vols.)

VOL. 3.

S. ANTONINO AND MEDIÆVAL ECONOMICS. By the Rev. Bede Jarrett, O.P.

VOL. 5.

HOLY MASS: THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE AND THE ROMAN LITURGY. By the Rev. Herbert Lucas, S.J., vol. I. (From the Beginning to the Canon).

VOL. 6.

CAMPION'S TEN REASONS. The original Latin text, with a translation by the Rev. Joseph Rickaby, S.J., and an historical Introduction by the Rev. John Hungerford Pollen, S.J.

LONDON:

THE MANRESA PRESS, ROEHAMPTON, S.W.
B. HERDER, 68, GREAT RUSSELL ST., W.C.

GENERAL PSYCHOLOGICAL SEMINAR
NEW YORK

GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
NEW YORK

DATE DUE

[illegible]

BX 2230 .L82 1914 v.2

Lucas, Herbert, 1852-1933.

Holy mass

GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY



00033009